THE NATIONAL CHURCHES

ENGLAND

VOL. I.

J. H. OVERTON.

BRECON CATHEDRAL LIBRARY.

K. STEVE McCORMICK

283
AIII

"The general idea of the series is excellent."—GUARDIAN.
"The scheme excites our interest."—SATURDAY REVIEW.

THE NATIONAL CHURCHES.

I.—GERMANY.

BY THE REV. S. BARING GOULD, M.A.,
Author of "Mehalah," "Germany Past and Present," &c.
With Maps. Cr. 8vo, cloth boards, **6**/-.

"Mr. Baring-Gould's contribution is excellent . . . one of the best accounts in English of the German Reformation that we have ever come across."—GUARDIAN.

II.—SPAIN.

BY THE REV. FREDERICK MEYRICK, M.A.,
Prebendary of Lincoln.
With Map. Cr. 8vo, cloth boards, **6**/-.

"It is a really valuable work."—MANCHESTER EXAMINER.

III.—IRELAND.

BY THE REV. THOMAS OLDEN, M.A.,
Vicar of Ballyclough.
With Maps. Cr. 8vo, cloth boards, **6**/-.

"Seldom has the student of Irish history the good fortune to encounter work so learned and so simple, so instructive and so entertaining, as this brilliant epitome of the history of the early Irish Church."—ATHENÆUM.

IV.—THE NETHERLANDS.

BY THE REV. P. H. DITCHFIELD, M.A.,
With two Maps. Cr. 8vo, cloth boards, **6**/-.

"The books from which the material of the prior part is drawn are so thoroughly inaccessible to English readers that the work has the value which attaches to the monopoly of the subject. But it does not need this to recommend it to any one who takes an interest in Church history."—THE SCOTSMAN.

V.—SCOTLAND.

BY THE VERY REV. H. M. LUCKOCK, D.D.,
Dean of Lichfield.
With two Maps. Cr. 8vo, cloth boards, **6**/-.

"His pages are packed with facts from which you are at liberty to draw your conclusions, and which he never garbles or distorts with a view to bolstering up his own. He displays a really surprising comprehension of affairs peculiarly Scottish."—NATIONAL OBSERVER.

VI.—ITALY.

BY THE REV. A. R. PENNINGTON, M.A.,
Canon of Lincoln.

With Maps. Cr. 8vo, cloth boards, **6/-**.

"A most valuable addition to that very instructive and useful series 'The National Churches.'"—RECORD.

"The plan of the work is at once comprehensive and compact, and the style and treatment easy and luminous."—SCOTSMAN.

VII.—FRANCE.

BY THE REV. R. TRAVERS SMITH, D.D.,
Canon of St. Patrick's, Dublin.

With Maps. Cr. 8vo, cloth boards, **6/-**.

"Few could fail to be greatly interested in the work before us . . . The student will learn much from the clear arrangement of the attractive topics which go to make up the book . . . We cordially recommend this History to students of a fascinating and too much neglected subject."—CHURCH TIMES.

VIII.—AMERICA.

BY THE RIGHT REV. LEIGHTON COLEMAN,
Bishop of Delaware, U.S.A.

With Map. Cr. 8vo, cloth boards, **6/-**.

IX.—ENGLAND.

BY THE REV. JOHN HENRY OVERTON, D.D.,
Rector of Epworth and Canon of Lincoln.

In two Vols. Vol. 1 with Map. Cr. 8vo, cloth boards, **6/-**.

X.—ENGLAND.

BY THE REV. JOHN HENRY OVERTON, D.D.,
Rector of Epworth and Canon of Lincoln.

In two Vols. Vol. 2 with Map. Cr. 8vo, cloth boards, **6/-**.

LONDON : GARDNER, DARTON & Co.
NEW YORK : JAMES POTT & Co.

283

The National Churches.

EDITED BY

P. H. DITCHFIELD, M.A., F.R.HIST.S.

THE

CHURCH IN ENGLAND.

THE

CHURCH IN ENGLAND.

K. STEVENSON

BY

JOHN HENRY OVERTON, D.D.

RECTOR OF EPWORTH AND CANON OF LINCOLN.

IN TWO VOLUMES.

VOL. I.

LONDON:

GARDNER, DARTON & CO.

3, PATERNOSTER BUILDINGS, E.C.

AND 44, VICTORIA STREET, S.W.

1897.

PREFACE.

THOUGH there are many excellent Histories of the Church of England, there are few, so far as I am aware, that approach the subject from precisely the same point of view from which it is regarded in these volumes. There are Histories in which the Church is regarded as a purely spiritual society, and in which her connection with the State is a secondary and quite accidental matter; and there are Histories of the Church as a National Church, in which her State connection is defended, and which are written for the laudable, and in these days most necessary, purpose of 'Church Defence.' Unlike the first class, these volumes deal largely with what may be termed the 'nationality' of the Church—as, indeed, considering that they form part of a series dealing with 'National Churches,' they were bound to do; they strive to bring out prominently how, from the very first, the Church has been inextricably interwoven with the life of the nation; and they dwell upon the action of kings and statesmen, and upon matters which are, in one sense, secular matters, more fully than purely ecclesiastical Histories are wont to do. Unlike the second class, their primary object is, not 'Church

Defence,' but simply to state facts, to whatever conclusion those facts may lead.

Another *differentia* arises from the fact that this work is one of a series. If it had stood alone, it would have been necessary to explain more fully the relation of the Church of England to other Churches in communion with her; but as the history of these sister Churches has already appeared, or will appear, in the same series, it has been thought sufficient to touch very lightly upon this important matter, especially as the vast amount of material to be worked up rendered it essential to economize space to the utmost possible degree.

It only remains for me to return my hearty thanks to those who have helped me in the work. The President of Corpus Christi College, Oxford (Dr. Fowler), has read and revised all that is written about the rise of the Oxford Colleges, and about the Renaissance; the Bishop of Oxford (Dr. Stubbs) has given his opinion—which to my mind is final—on a matter of essential importance connected with the whole of the history of the early English Church; and the valuable advice of the editor of the series, the Rev. P. H. Ditchfield, has been repeatedly sought, and ungrudgingly given, in all parts of the work.

J. H. O.

Epworth Rectory,
July 10, 1897.

CONTENTS OF VOL. I.

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	THE BRITISH CHURCH - - - -	1
II.	THE EARLY ENGLISH CHURCH — FROM THE MISSION OF AUGUSTINE TO THE COUNCIL OF WHITBY (596-664 A.D.) - - -	17
III.	THE EARLY ENGLISH CHURCH — FROM THE COUNCIL OF WHITBY TO THE DEATH OF BEDE (664-735 A.D.) - - -	66
IV.	THE EARLY ENGLISH CHURCH — FROM THE DEATH OF BEDE TO THE DEATH OF ALFRED (735-901 A.D.) - - - -	106
V.	THE EARLY ENGLISH CHURCH — FROM THE DEATH OF ALFRED TO THE NORMAN CONQUEST (901-1066) - - - -	126
VI.	THE MEDIÆVAL CHURCH—FROM THE NORMAN CONQUEST TO THE DEATH OF HENRY I. (1066-1135) - - - - -	156
VII.	THE MEDIÆVAL CHURCH—FROM THE ACCESSION OF STEPHEN TO THE VASSALAGE OF JOHN (1135-1213) - - - - -	193
VIII.	THE MEDIÆVAL CHURCH—FROM THE VASSALAGE OF JOHN TO THE DEATH OF HENRY III. (1213-1272) - - - - -	225

CHAPTER PAGE

IX. THE MEDIÆVAL CHURCH—FROM THE ACCESSION OF EDWARD I. TO THE DEATH OF WICLIF (1272-1384) - - - - - 250

X. THE MEDIÆVAL CHURCH—FROM THE DEATH OF WICLIF TO THE ACCESSION OF HENRY VII. (1384-1485) - - - - - 295

XI. THE RENAISSANCE - - - - 320

XII. THE TUDOR PERIOD—THE CHURCH IN THE REIGN OF HENRY VIII. (1509-1547) - - 352

XIII. THE TUDOR PERIOD—THE CHURCH IN THE REIGN OF EDWARD VI. (1547-1553) - 393

XIV. THE TUDOR PERIOD—THE CHURCH IN THE REIGN OF QUEEN MARY I. (1553-1558) - 411

XV. THE TUDOR PERIOD—THE CHURCH IN THE REIGN OF QUEEN ELIZABETH (1558-1603) - 430

CORRIGENDA.

Vol. i., page 20, line 10, *for* 'Lindhard' *read* 'Liudhard.'
,, page 45, line 5, *for* 'Oswiu' *read* 'Oswin.'
,, page 87, line 6, *for* 'Erconwald' *read* 'Erkenwald.'
,, page 97, line 24, *for* 'Maidulf' *read* 'Mailduf.'
,, page 113, line 3, *for* 'Calchith' *read* 'Calchuith.'
,, page 138, line 15, *for* 'Benedictism' *read* 'Benedictinism.'
,, page 187, line 16, *for* 'Thurston' *read* 'Thurstan.'
,, page 248, note, *for* 'unbiased' *read* 'unbiassed.'
,, page 306, line 29, *for* 'William' *read* 'Thomas.'
,, page 310, line 11, *for* 'writing' *read* 'witing.'
,, page 451, line 15, *for* 'othre' *read* 'other.'
Vol. ii., page 113, line 3, *for* 'Querula' *read* 'Querela.'
,, page 346, line 14, *for* 'Fox' *read* 'Foxe.'
,, page 352, lines 23 and 32, and page 357, line 22, *for* 'Philpotts' *read* 'Phillpotts.'
,, page 356, line 9, *for* 'lwoyer' *read* 'lower.'

HISTORY OF THE CHURCH IN ENGLAND

CHAPTER I.

THE BRITISH CHURCH.

Church anterior to nation—Possible origin in Apostolic times—King Lucius—Gaul the source of British Christianity—Evidences of its existence in the second and third centuries—Diocletian persecution and S. Alban—Growth of the Church in Britain—Its comparative freedom from Arianism—Pelagianism in the fifth century—Germanus and Lupus—Hallelujah Victory—Second mission of Germanus—Iltutus, Dubricius, S. Patrick, and S. Ninian—The British Church a missionary Church—Its degeneracy deplored by Gildas—Its persecution by Saxon invaders—Its continuance in spite of persecution—Its monasteries: Glastonbury, the Bangors, etc.—Obscurity of its history—Summary.

A 'National Church' presupposes the existence of a nation. It may, therefore, seem strange to commence the history of the National Church of England long before there was any such nation as England: and yet it is necessary for a right understanding of our subject to touch upon the evidences of the existence of Christianity on our soil ages before the name of Englishman had ever been heard. And not only

of Christianity, but of an organized Church; for it would be far nearer the truth to say that the Church helped to mould and weld together the nation than the nation the Church.[1]

Some learned writers, whose opinions cannot be lightly dismissed, trace back the origin of the Church in Britain to Apostolic times. S. Joseph of Arimathæa, S. Peter, S. Philip, S. James the Greater, S. Simon Zelotes, and S. Paul, have all been claimed as its founders. The arguments in favour of the first five are so slight that they need not here be discussed. But, if for no other reason, yet for the weight of the names of those who have inclined to the opinion that S. Paul really did introduce Christianity into Britain,[2] this theory must not be dismissed without notice. At the same time, it must be admitted that the evidence produced is both vague and scanty. Clemens Romanus says that S. Paul preached righteousness through the world, and in so doing went to the limit of the West—an expression which, as Canon Bright observes, would naturally mean Spain rather than Britain;[3] the Claudia and Pudens mentioned by S. Paul (2 Tim. iv. 21) have been identified with the Claudia and Pudens mentioned by Martial as Britons

[1] This point is well brought out and illustrated in detail by Mr. J. R. Green—'Short History of the English People,' p. 30, and 'The Making of England,' pp. 311, 334.

[2] Among these is the great name of Bishop Stillingfleet, whose lawyer-like mind rendered him peculiarly competent to sift evidence. See his 'Origines Britannicæ; or, The Antiquities of the British Churches,' *passim*, esp. i., 53-55. See also Archbishop Ussher's 'Britannicarum Ecclesiarum Antiquitates.' But since these learned authors wrote, historical criticism has advanced enormously.

[3] See 'Chapters of Early English Church History,' by W. Bright.

—which, even supposing it to be correct, goes a very little way towards proving that S. Paul preached in Britain; Eusebius (A.D. 270-330) says that some of the Apostles passed over the ocean to the islands called British, but does not mention S. Paul; S. Jerome (A.D. 347-420) asserts that S. Paul, after his imprisonment, preached the Gospel in the Western parts—which might refer to many other places besides Britain; S. Chrysostom, that the Apostle went from Illyricum to the very ends of the earth. Theodoret, in the fifth century, mentions the Britons among the nations converted by the Apostles, and in another passage says that 'S. Paul brought salvation to the islands that lie in the ocean'; and in another, that 'our fishermen and publicans and the leather-cutter carried the laws of the Gospel to all mankind, not only to Romans, but to Scythians, Sarmatians, and Britons'—which comes nearer to the point, but still falls far short of being any demonstrative proof that the Apostle of the Gentiles ever visited our shores. All that can be safely inferred is, that such a visit is not incompatible with the language of some of the early Fathers.

We next come to the story of a certain British King, Lucius, in the later part of the second century, who is said to have sent an application to Eleutherus (or Eleutherius), Bishop of Rome, the result of which was that Britain was converted to Christianity. King Lucius, if there ever was such a King, could have had but a very limited sway, probably only a part of what was afterwards called Surrey and Sussex, for Britain was under the rule of a number of petty princes. Gildas, the earliest British historian, ignores the story altogether, which is suspicious. At the same time,

there may have been a King Lucius, and he may have been a Christian. The early historian who writes under the name of Nennius states this distinctly. Bede tells the whole story; so does the ancient Book of Llandaff ('Liber Landavensis'); so do the later chroniclers, William of Malmesbury and Geoffrey of Monmouth, with fresh details which do not at all strengthen the story; and there is nothing inherently improbable in the belief that Lucius did help to spread Christianity, so far as his influence extended.

But circumstances point to Gaul as the most likely source of British Christianity.[1] There had always been a communication between Gaul and Britain; before either had been converted to Christianity there had been a community of faith between them. Cæsar tells us that the religion of Britain and Gaul was one; that it originated in Britain, and that students went from Gaul, as to a holy isle, for instruction. It was therefore natural that, when the Gauls embraced a better faith, they should desire to communicate it to the Britons. There was a singular resemblance between the types of Christianity in the two countries; and, as we shall see, the impulse of the British Christians in their difficulties was to turn to Gaul as their natural resource. Indeed, the British Church in its early days seems to have been regarded as a sort of dependent branch of the Gallican Church; and even at the Council of Arles (A.D. 314)

[1] The evidence of its having come from the East, as some assume, is very slight—if, indeed, it can be called direct evidence at all. It may have come indirectly from the East through Gaul. See on this point Mr. Newell's 'History of the Welsh Church,' pp. 14-17.

its bishops were reckoned among those 'from the Gauls.'[1]

At any rate, however derived, it is clear that Christianity had made some way in Britain before the close of the second century. Among other evidences, we have that of Tertullian, who writes at the beginning of the third century (A.D. 208) that 'the kingdom of Christ had advanced among the Gauls and Britons, and Christ was solemnly worshipped by them;' and he speaks in another passage of 'places [in Britain] unapproached by the Romans, but subdued to Christ'; while a few years later Origen distinctly affirms that Britain possessed the light of the Gospel. It is true that the history of the Church in Britain during the whole of the third century is a blank; but Gildas asserts generally that, 'though the Christian religion was but coldly entertained,[2] it held on in some places without the least discontinuance as far as the Diocletian persecution'; Bede, that 'the Britons, being brought over to Christianity [by Lucius], continued without warping or disturbance till the reign of the Emperor Diocletian'; and the Book of Llandaff, that, 'according to the form of Eleutherius' instruction, the ecclesiastical order was settled, bishops were ordained, and the

[1] Canon Raine, a high authority, can go no further than to admit that 'it [Christianity] probably crept over from Gaul in the course of the first century after Christ,' Gaul itself, however, as he adds, not being *entirely* evangelized until the middle of the third century. See 'The Historians of the Church of York and its Archbishops,' Rolls Series, ed. Raine, Preface, xx.

[2] Mr. Collier ('Ecclesiastical History,' p. 27) interprets this to mean that it was 'confined to a narrow compass'; but it is hard to see how this meaning can be drawn from the words.

Christian religion further propagated among the inhabitants.' All this is rather vague, and the last two passages of less value because they occur in connection with the doubtful story of Lucius; but all three deserve attention as coming from native and very early authors.

With the fourth century the British Church again emerges from its obscurity. The last and fiercest of the Ten Persecutions of the Christian Church took place in 303 A.D. It extended to Britain, though its severity, at least in the Northern parts, was tempered by the residence of Constantius, as Cæsar, at York; for Constantius, though not a Christian himself, set his face against the persecution of Christians. Britain, however, achieved the honours of martyrdom; for, in spite of many details which are clearly unhistorical, and dates which are doubtful, the broad facts of the tale of S. Alban may be accepted as history. At Verulam a Christian priest fled for refuge from the persecution to the house of Alban, a soldier of high rank, who was so impressed with his guest's pious and humble conduct that he became a Christian himself; and when the persecutors tracked the fugitive to his retreat, Alban himself appeared in the priest's cloak or cassock, declared that *he* was the man for whom they were searching, and suffered in his stead. One of the soldiers who guarded him to the place of execution was so struck with his conduct that he, too, declared himself a Christian, and suffered with him. Large numbers of British Christians are said to have perished in this persecution. Bede affirms there were nearly a thousand, but the only two names that have come down to us are those of Aaron and Julius, both citizens of Caerleon-on-

Usk,[1] then the centre of British Christianity; the name of Amphibalus, supposed by some to have been a martyr at Venta Belgarum, afterwards Winchester, by others at St. Alban's,[2] was in all probability only the name of the cloak in which S. Alban wrapped himself.

As usual, the blood of the martyrs was the seed of the Church; and the persecution was stayed, not from compassion, but because it was found to be defeating its own end, and, instead of stamping out Christianity, to be fostering its growth.

The Church in Britain certainly *did* grow,[3] having for its three chief centres London, York, and Caerleon-on-Usk, corresponding to the Roman provincial divisions, Britannia Prima, of which the capital was London; Maxima Cæsariensis, York; Britannia Secunda, Caerleon. Some have said that these were the seats of three archbishoprics, and that each Archbishop had several suffragans under him; but this is not substantiated. It is certain, however, that at the Council of Arles, A.D. 314, the British Church was represented by three bishops;[4] that in

[1] So called to distinguish it from Caerleon-on-Dee.

[2] See Mr. O'Dell Travers Hill's 'English Monasticism: its Rise and Influence,' and 'Historic Winchester,' by A. R. Bramston and A. C. Leroy, p. 5. The fact that there is still at St. Albans a shrine of S. Amphibalus only proves that there was a tradition about the supposed martyr, not that he really existed.

[3] Gildas, a very early authority, tells us that after the persecution 'old churches were soon repaired, new ones built, and Christians who had timidly concealed themselves during the persecution again came forward, bringing from their hiding-places an ardent zeal to spread the faith of Jesus.'

[4] Eborius of York, Restitutus of London, and a third called in the conciliar lists 'Adelphius de civitate colonia Londinensium.'

the same year Constantine acknowledged Christianity as the religion of the whole empire, of which Britain formed part; that the remains of a Christian Church of this period have been discovered at Silchester,[1] and that there were remains of old churches, dating from Roman times, when Ethelbert was baptized;[2] that Constantine transmitted to the British Church an account of the Council of Nice (A.D. 325); that Britain approved of the decision in favour of S. Athanasius at the Council of Sardica (A.D. 347); and that there were three British bishops at the Council of Ariminum (A.D. 359), who were so poor that they had to be sent at the public expense.

We have also remarkable testimony from some of the most eminent Fathers of the fourth century to the soundness of the Britons' faith, when Arianism was rife. In 358 A.D. S. Hilary congratulates the British bishops on their orthodoxy, and declares that 'they had preserved themselves all along from heretical infection.' In 363 S. Athanasius specially mentions the Britons as being loyal to the Nicene faith. S. Chrysostom affirms that 'even the British Isles have felt the power of the Word,' and adds

---

But 'Londinensium' is evidently a mistake, some think for 'Camulodensium' (Colchester), others for 'Legionensium' Caerleon), but more probably for 'Lindi' (Lincoln), 'Lindum' being certainly a *colonia*.

[1] See Gardiner's 'Student's History of England,' p. 23.

[2] 'When King Ethelbert was baptized, he told them they might build and *repair* the churches throughout the land. Hence there must have been some of the old Roman churches still standing, though probably in ruins. Or if *restaurare* means "build again in the same place," it shows men still knew where the old churches had stood.'—'Old English History,' by E. A. Freeman, p. 47.

that 'men may be found there discussing points in Scripture with differing voices, but not with differing belief;' and S. Jerome asserts that Britain 'worships the same Christ, observes the same rule of truth, as the rest of Christendom.' This testimony is more than a set-off against the assertions of Gildas and Bede,[1] that Arianism made great way in Britain. Doubtless it spread there as it did elsewhere, but, balancing one account against another, it is fair to assume that Britain was comparatively free from the prevailing heresy.

Not so, however, from another heresy, which distracted the Church in the early part of the fifth century. Pelagianism derived its name from one who was probably a Briton by birth, though he spent much of his life at Rome—Morgan, who, after the fashion of the times, changed his name into its classical equivalent, Pelagius. Pelagianism, however, was introduced into Britain, not by Pelagius, but by his disciple, Agricola, who had fled to Britain from Gaul on account of his opinions. The simple Britons were not equal to cope with his arguments, which perverted many from the faith ; so they applied for aid to their better-instructed neighbours across the Channel. The application was productive of the happiest results. The Gallic bishops met in council, and determined to send over Germanus, Bishop of Auxerre, and Lupus, Bishop of Troyes, Germanus having been, according to the account of Prosper of Aquitaine, already commissioned by Pope Celestine to go and rescue the Britons from heresy. Lupus is

[1] Gildas is too vague and declamatory to be accepted as a very high authority, and Bede too obviously prejudiced against the British Church.

noted for his moral victory over Attila,[1] and also as being probably the brother of Vincentius of Lerins, whose famous dictum ('quod semper,' etc.) has been the watchword of Catholicism up to this very day. But Germanus was the man whose advent was an epoch in the British Church. The so-called Nennius makes him his hero, and attributes to him numerous miracles. So does Bede. But in spite of the obviously legendary element in the story, there is no reason to doubt that there is in it a substratum of historical fact. It may well be believed that he and Lupus confuted the Pelagians in a council held at, or near, Verulamium, and that they preached with wonderful effect, not only in churches, but in the fields and by the wayside. And we need not be sceptical about the main facts of the striking story which tells us how the Picts and Saxons invaded the land, and how the Britons in their distress appealed to those who had been so successful in delivering them from their spiritual enemies to save them from their earthly foes, and how, under the direction of Germanus, they won a bloodless victory It is not the first nor yet the last time that religious enthusiasm has triumphed over earthly strength and courage. It was the Easter-tide of 430 A.D. The British soldiers had been stirred up daily by the preaching of Germanus and Lupus. The Lenten fast had, by the example and authority of the Gallic prelates, been kept with unusual solemnity. A large part, some say the majority, of the army had been baptized on the Easter Eve—which, if it be true, shows how great a need there was of the mission of Germanus; thus they went forth, strong

[1] See Montalembert's 'Monks of the West,' i. 470.

in their new faith, to combat the enemies of God and man. Germanus ordered all the troops to say what they should hear him and Lupus say. They were ranged in a valley surrounded on all sides by mountains,[1] and as the enemy advanced, the prelates cried with a loud voice, 'Hallelujah!' The whole army repeated the cry, which was echoed by the surrounding rocks; and the enemy, thinking that the powers of the air were in league against them, fled in a panic. This was the famous 'Hallelujah Victory.'

Germanus and Lupus, having brought into use in the British churches the Gallican liturgy ('ordinem cursûs Gallorum'), 'left the Britons well settled in the ancient faith,' and returned to Gaul. But Pelagianism again made way in Britain, and in 447 A.D. Germanus was again appealed to; he returned, bringing with him this time Severus, Bishop of Treves, and again confirmed the Britons in the Nicene faith. He is said also to have established monasteries and schools, which became famous for their learning, especially the school of Iltutus (S. Illtyd), his great-nephew and disciple. 'In the school of Iltutus,' says an early writer, 'many noblemen's sons were brought up' ('Life of Gildas'). The tradition that a still more famous teacher, Dubricius, was also a pupil of Germanus is not consistent with dates;[2] but that Dubricius was, at a later date, a great Christian instructor is doubtless true. 'His fame extended throughout all Britain, so that there came scholars from all parts to him.' Whether he was really the founder of the bishopric of Llandaff

[1] The scene is said to have been near Mold, in Flintshire.

[2] Germanus died in 448 A.D., Dubricius probably in 612 A.D.

is another question. He is called by some writers 'Archbishop of all Britain' and Bishop 'dextralis partis Britanniæ'; by others, 'Archbishop of Caerleon,' with seven suffragans under him; and when he laid down his episcopal office, he is said to have consecrated David, the patron saint of Wales, as 'Archbishop of Wales' in his stead.[1]

That the great S. Patrick, the Apostle of Ireland, was also a pupil of S. Germanus is more than doubtful. Happily, it does not fall within the province of this work to enter into the thorny question of S. Patrick's history. But this much, at any rate, may be said, that he was certainly a native of Britain, though he received his Christian training in Gaul under S. Martin of Tours. And so the British Church may fairly claim the credit of being virtually the mother Church of Ireland. To a certain extent she may also claim the title as regards what is now called Scotland; for no one was so successful in evangelizing, at least a large district in the south of that region, as S. Ninian, a native Briton, who built, in what was then called Galloway, a stone church (a rare thing then) and monastery which gave the name to Whithern, or 'Candida Casa,' the White House,[2] and who 'preached the word to the Southern Picts';[3] while the Northern Picts mainly owed their conversion to S. Columba, the successor of S. Ninian, and his twelve monks, all Scots from Ireland, and therefore ultimately sprung from the British Church.

[1] For an account of S. David see 'Monks of the West,' iii. 48, etc.; also, 'History of the Welsh Church,' by E. J. Newell.

[2] See Montalembert's 'Monks of the West,' iii. 19, etc.

[3] Bede, iii. 4.

Thus the British became a missionary Church, the surest of all signs of a Church's growth.

But if the vehement invectives of Gildas are to be taken literally, the fair promise she gave after the second mission of S. Germanus was far indeed from being fulfilled. In the strain of an old Hebrew prophet—indeed, applying literally to his countrymen the denunciations of those prophets—he declared that the disasters which they suffered from the Scots and Picts and Saxons were brought upon them by their own sins, and especially by the shortcomings of their Church. But the language he uses is evidently rhetorical; and it would be unjust to take his highly-coloured picture as an accurate delineation of the state of the British Church, though it is fair to add that he is to some extent confirmed by the Book of Llandaff itself, and other Welsh documents.[1] Nor must we lay too much stress upon the fact that the British Christians made no efforts to convert their Saxon invaders—in fact, that they rather set their faces against such conversion. For a time of war and bloodshed is not a time when Christian work can easily be done; and it requires a more Christ-like spirit than these very rudimentary Christians possessed to labour for the welfare of men who were most savage enemies to their religion. The British Christians were harried by the heathen invaders out of their land,[2] and had to take refuge in the mountain

[1] See Newell's 'History of the Welsh Church,' pp. 53-55.

[2] Gildas applies to their calamity the Scripture texts: 'They have set fire upon the holy places, and have defiled the dwelling-place of Thy Name even unto the ground'; 'O God, the heathen are come into Thine inheritance, Thy holy Temple have they defiled, and made Jerusalem an heap of stones.'

fastnesses of the regions now called Wales and Cumbria, or in the far south-western districts of Devon and Cornwall, or to flee to another Britain across the sea; for 'the Saxons left not the face of Christianity wherever they did prevail.'

Nevertheless, British Christianity still survived. Bede tells us that the monastery of Bangor was 'furnished with learned men at the coming of Augustine,' which is a great admission for Bede to make, his prejudices against everything connected with the British Church being very strong; and there were, in fact, many Bangors, all Christian centres. The most famous of the Welsh saints—S. David, S. Asaph, and S. Padarn—all flourished after the Saxon had occupied England, and the sixth century was the period in which not only the Welsh bishoprics, but also the great Welsh monasteries, which were 'the especial glory of the Church in Wales,'[1] were founded. Nor must we altogether omit to notice the widely-spread tradition that Glastonbury, the earliest home of legendary Christianity in England, was at that troubled time a great Christian centre. 'At Glastonbury,' writes Dr. Freeman, 'and at Glastonbury alone, we instinctively feel that the name of England is not all, for here, and here alone, we walk with easy slope from the realm of Saxon Ina back to that of Arthur, the hero King of the British race.' It is said that to Glastonbury, which, owing to its remoteness and isolation, was comparatively safe from the heathen Saxons, 'all that was most sacred and venerated in the churches of Christian Britain was carried.' But the early legends of Glastonbury, though very

[1] Newell's 'History of the Welsh Church,' p. 55.

beautiful, can hardly be regarded as a literal part of serious history.[1] In fact, all through the Anglo-Saxon period, the British remnant held tenaciously to their Church, with all its customs, 'counting,' says Bede, 'the Christianity of their conquerors as a thing of naught.' Overtures were frequently made to them, but all in vain; and it was not till many years had elapsed that the British became gradually merged in the English Church.

The *secular* history of Britain is obscure enough, but its ecclesiastical history is far more so. A few broad, general facts are all that can be predicated with absolute certainty about the British Church. That it was closely connected with the Gallic Church all through its history; that it exercised a beneficial influence upon a race which had been devoted to one of the most cruel of all false religions; that it held substantially the faith once for all delivered unto the saints; that it looked, with a certain degree of reverence, to Rome, both as the nearest Apostolical see[2] and as the seat of a once world-wide empire,

[1] For an account of Glastonbury in British times, see Montalembert's 'Monks of the West,' iii. 274, etc.; also, 'The Last Abbot of Glastonbury and his Companions,' by F. A. Gasquet, first twelve pages.

[2] It should not be forgotten that in the time of the early British Church there were *four* sees which were regarded as Apostolic sees—Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem, and Rome; and the rights of the four were the same and equal. What gave Rome a certain undefined pre-eminence was that it had been the metropolis of a world-wide empire. Thus the third canon of the Council of Constantinople (A.D. 381), says: 'Let the Bishop of Constantinople have rank next after the Bishop of Rome, for *Constantinople is New Rome*.' And to the same effect the twenty-eighth canon of the Council of Chalcedon (A.D. 451): 'The Fathers, with reason, gave precedency to the throne of

from which it had received at least protection ; that it has left some traces of its existence, chiefly in the great Roman towns of Britain—all this is beyond a doubt ; but further than this we can do little more than choose the most probable of conjectures. And it will be a relief to turn from the region of doubtful legend to that of known historical fact.

Old Rome, *because it was the imperial city ;* and the 150 bishops beloved of God, moved by the same consideration, awarded equal precedency to the most holy throne of New Rome, reasonably judging that a city which is honoured with the Government and Senate should enjoy equal rank with the ancient Queen Rome, and, like her, be magnified in ecclesiastical matters, having the second place after her.'

CHAPTER II.

THE EARLY ENGLISH CHURCH.

From the Mission of Augustine to the Council of Whitby (596-664 A.D.).

The English ripe for Christianity—Story of Gregory in the slave-market—Mission of Augustine—His interview with King Ethelbert—Success of the missionaries in Kent—Augustine's questions and Gregory's answers—Gregory sends another band of missionaries, and fresh orders to Augustine—Ethelbert's help to the mission—Two conferences between Augustine and the British Christians—Bishops consecrated and cathedrals built for London and Rochester—Deaths of Gregory and Augustine—Laurentius Archbishop—Deaths of Ethelbert and Sabert—East Saxons lapse into heathenism—Withdrawal of Mellitus and Justus—Story of Laurentius and S. Peter—Northumbria and King Edwin—Story of Paulinus and the conversion of Edwin—Paulinus' work in the North—Battle of Hatfield Chase and partial collapse of the Church in Northumbria—Battle of Hevenfeld and revival of the Church under Oswald and Aidan—Death of Oswald, and of Aidan—Celtic and Roman types of Christianity—Church flourishing in Kent—Birinus, the Apostle of Wessex—Conversion of King Kynegils—Sees of Dorchester and Winchester—Conversion of East Anglia—King Sigebert, Felix the Burgundian, and Fursey the monk—Kings Sigebert and Anna both fall before Penda—Battle of Winwidfield, and defeat of Penda by Oswy—Conversion of Mercia under Peada—Diuma consecrated Bishop by Finan—Re-conversion of Essex—Cedd consecrated Bishop by Finan—Council of Whitby—Roman instead of Celtic usages prevail.

In spite of their bitter hostility to the British Church, the invading tribes—Angles, Saxons, and Jutes—were

probably ripe for the reception of Christianity. They must have heard and seen for themselves the beneficial effects of the new religion, which was now spreading in all directions. And we can well believe that Gregory the Great had not been misled when he wrote to the Frankish King and to Queen Brunehild, 'We are informed that the English nation is desirous to turn Christian, but your clergy refuse to assist' —and so forth.

What Gauls and Britons refused to do, that Gregory determined to do himself. There is no reason to doubt the well-known story which tells how, while yet a deacon, he met (about 585 A.D.), in the slave-market of Rome, some fair-haired boys exposed for sale; how, struck by their appearance—so different from that of the swarthy Italians—he asked to what nation they belonged; how, on being told that they were Angles, he exclaimed, 'Not Angles, but angels!' how he further inquired from what province they came, and, when informed that they were from Deira, replied, 'They must be delivered from the anger (de irâ) of God'; and how, inquiring further the name of their King, and learning that it was Ella, he cried, 'He must live to sing Alleluia.' The word-play may seem too childish for so serious a subject, but Gregory's subsequent conduct shows that he spoke, not playfully, but in all sober earnestness. He himself volunteered to go forth as a missionary to the home of the fair boys, but the people of Rome could not spare him, for he was a great statesman as well as an ecclesiastic, and the Pope would not allow him to make the journey. But in course of time he rose to the popedom himself, and then he had it in his power to carry out his

cherished plan, which he was not slow to do. In 596 A.D. he sent forth Augustine, Prior of his own monastery[1] of S. Andrew at Rome, with forty companions, to carry the message of the Gospel into the distant island.[2] But when they had crossed the Alps and reached Provence, they heard[3] such formidable reports of the wild islanders that their hearts misgave them, and Augustine returned to Rome to obtain Gregory's permission to abandon the attempt. But Gregory would not permit this. He sent Augustine back, having raised him to the dignity of Abbot, so as to give him a fuller authority, and having armed him with letters of commendation to the kings and nobles, as well as the bishops and abbots, in the countries through which the missionaries had to pass. Then they took heart of grace, and, late in 596 or early in 597, landed in the Isle of Thanet,[4] and sent on the interpreters whom Gregory had given them[5] to hold an interview with Ethelbert (Æthelberht),[6] King of the country. That King had

[1] He had converted his own palace on the Cœlian Mount into this monastery.

[2] 'In this year [597] Gregorius the Pope sent into Britain Augustinus with very many monks, who gospelled God's Word to the English folk.'—Anglo-Saxon Chronicle. The chronicler gives the date of the arrival of the missionaries, but they started first in 596.

[3] Probably while they were visiting the monks at Lerins.

[4] Probably at Ebbsfleet, the very same place at which the first invaders, the Jutes, under Hengest and Horsa, had landed nearly a century and a half before. For a discussion of the exact spot at which the missionaries landed, see Bishop G. F. Browne's 'Augustine and his Companions,' pp. 28-38.

[5] By Gregory's instructions, they brought with them priests of the Frankish race.

[6] After much consideration it has been thought best to adopt

married a Christian, Bertha (Bercta), daughter of Charibert, King of Paris, and so they found the way prepared for them; indeed, it is more than probable that Gregory knew perfectly well the favourable opportunity which this alliance offered, and took advantage of it.[1] By the articles of marriage, it had been stipulated that Queen Bertha should have the free exercise of her religion. She had brought over with her, as a sort of spiritual director, Lindhard, the retired Bishop of Senlis; and there was assigned to the Queen and her Christian retinue an ancient Roman or British church at Canterbury, which was re-dedicated to the Gallic saint, Martin. The Queen and the Gallic Christians made no effort to convert the King, and were afterwards reproached by Gregory for their slackness. But Ethelbert's intimate connection with Christians in his own domestic circle must have disposed him favourably towards the missionaries of a faith which—being a candid and sensible man—he could hardly fail to recognise as superior to his own. But he knew so little of the true spirit of Christianity that he feared lest the black arts might be exercised against him if he received the strangers under a roof, so he stipulated that the interview should take place in the open air. The precaution would, as a matter of fact, make

---

the popular mode of spelling the Early English proper names, placing in brackets the more correct spelling the first time each name occurs.

[1] The fact that the missionaries landed in Kent instead of making for Deira (Yorkshire), as we might naturally have expected them to have done, may probably be accounted for by the knowledge which Gregory had that there was a Christian Queen in the southern kingdom.

the interview all the more impressive. Augustine had learned at Rome the important influence which the senses exercise over the mind. So he formed an imposing procession, headed by the bearer of a silver cross; he himself came next, 'higher than any of his people from the shoulders and upwards';[1] then followed the forty priests and monks, one of them carrying a painted board with a representation of the figure of our blessed Lord. They approached the King, who was sitting with his attendants under an oak, chanting the Psalms which they had learned from Gregory, Honorius, who thirty years later became a successor of Augustine at Canterbury, leading the choir. Then Augustine 'showed the King how the merciful Jesus had, by His own Passion, redeemed this guilty world, and opened the kingdom of heaven to all believers.'

The King was courteous, but cautious. The strangers spoke fair, but he could not give up the customs he had learned from his fathers until he had inquired further. Meanwhile, as they had come from afar, and seemed only to desire their good, they should be treated hospitably, and be allowed to make any converts they could.

Nothing could be more fair and reasonable; but one cannot help asking how it was that, with a Christian wife and her Christian retinue, King Ethelbert could have been so ignorant of Christianity. It may be that he knew more than he confessed, and that he wished the new doctrine to make its way by

[1] 'Beati Augustini formam et personam patriciam, staturam proceram et arduam, adeo ut a scapulis populo supereminceret.' —Gotsel, 'Vita,' c. 45, quoted in Canon Bright's 'Chapters of Early English Church History,' p. 46.

its own inherent merits, without the adventitious aid of the royal authority. If so, he was not disappointed. The first success in Kent was extraordinarily rapid; we hear of ten thousand being baptized on one day (Christmas Day, 597 A.D.);[1] the King himself was baptized in S. Martin's Church, and henceforth became to the end of his life a true and powerful supporter of Christianity within his own little kingdom, which at that time appears to have held a leading position in England. With an enlightenment beyond his age, and, indeed, beyond that of many ages later, he perceived that Christianity was a religion that could not be forced upon anyone, though outward conformity to it might be; so he compelled no one to be baptized, but only showed more favour to those who had embraced the same faith with himself.

At first the missionaries were allowed the use of that church of S. Martin which had been assigned to the Queen; but they soon lengthened their cords and strengthened their stakes. Augustine, by the direction of Gregory, returned to France to be consecrated by Vergilius,[2] Archbishop of Arles, then the leading city of the South of France, 'Bishop' or

[1] It is not easy to ascertain the exact status of Ethelbert. 'He had an honorary supremacy over his Saxon neighbours in the South,' writes Mr. Pearson ('History of England during the Early and Middle Ages,' i. 120). 'Ethelbert was recognised as Overlord in the kingdoms of the East Saxons, Anglians, and Mercians,' writes Bishop Browne ('Augustine and his Companions,' p. 39). Dr. Lingard calls him Bretwalda III., and says 'he had acquired [by what means we are not informed] the dignity of Bretwalda, and his authority was admitted by all the Saxon princes south of the Humber' ('History of England,' vol. i., ch. ii., p. 53).

[2] Not Ætherius, as Bede says.

'Archbishop'[1] of the English nation. Augustine, however, in a letter to Gregory soon after, styles himself 'Bishop of the Church of Canterbury.' That letter, containing a number of questions on various points, and Gregory's answer to it, give us an interesting glimpse of the Church of the period. The first question is 'Concerning bishops: how they are to behave themselves towards their clergy? or into how many portions the things given to the altar are to be divided?' For answer to the first part of the question Gregory gives Augustine a very obvious reference to S. Paul's Epistle to Timothy, and for the second tells him that all emoluments are to be divided into four portions: one for the Bishop and his family, because of hospitality and entertainments; another for the clergy; a third for the poor; and the fourth for the repair of churches. But, as Augustine had been brought up under monastic rules, he was not to live apart from his clergy, but they were to have all things in common. The next question is very much to the point: 'Whereas the faith is one and the same, why are there different customs in different Churches? and why is one custom of Masses observed in the holy Roman Church, and another in the Gallican Church?' Gregory's admirable answer is: 'You know, my brother, the custom of the Roman Church, in which you remember you were brought up. But it pleases me, that if you have found anything, either in the Roman, or the Gallican, or any other Church, which may be more acceptable to Almighty God, you carefully make choice of the same, and sedulously teach

[1] Bede says 'Archbishop.'

the Church of the English, which as yet is new in the faith, whatsoever you can gather from the several Churches. For things are not to be loved for the sake of places, but places for the sake of things. Choose, therefore, from every Church those things that are pious, religious, and upright, and when you have, as it were, made them up into one body, let the minds of the English be accustomed thereto.' Augustine showed little of this eclectic spirit in his after-conduct. Of the rest of the questions, the sixth alone need detain us: 'How are we to behave to the bishops of France and Britain?' To which Gregory replies that the bishops of Gaul were outside his jurisdiction; but 'as to the bishops of Britain, we commit them all to thy fraternity, that the unlearned may be taught, the weak strengthened by persuasion, the perverse corrected by authority' —instructions which, as will appear, were fraught with serious consequences. Some of the questions and answers remind us that we are dealing with earlier and less delicate ages than our own; but it is difficult to condemn either Augustine or Gregory of coarseness without involving in the condemnation many passages in the Old Testament.[1]

The work grew so rapidly that in 601 A.D. Gregory sent forth another band of missionaries to help Augustine, of whom the chief were Mellitus, Justus, Paulinus, and Rufinianus. He also conferred upon Augustine the pallium, or pall,[2] and wrote him a

[1] All the questions and answers are given in full by Bede in his 'Ecclesiastical History,' translated by J. A. Giles, ch. xxvii., pp. 40-52.

[2] Gregory writes (June 22, 601): 'Since the new Church of the English has been brought to the grace of God by thy

letter, which indicates that he was under the impression that Christianity had spread much more widely than it had done. Augustine is to ordain twelve bishops in several places, who were to be subject to his authority; but the Bishop of London[1] was for the future always to be consecrated by his own synod, and to receive the pall. Augustine was also to send a Bishop to York, who, if necessary, was to ordain twelve bishops, and to be a Metropolitan, and to receive the pall; but during Augustine's lifetime York was to be under his jurisdiction. Immediately afterwards he sent another order to Augustine, through Mellitus: The idol temples were not to be destroyed, but the idols in them were; the holy-water was to be sprinkled, altars erected, and relics placed in them; and instead of the heathen sacrifices they were 'on the day of the dedication, or the nativities of the holy martyrs, whose relics are there deposited, to build themselves huts of the boughs of

labours, the same Lord giving His favour, we concede to thee the use of the pallium in the said Church of the English, but only for the celebration of Masses.' Bishop Browne remarks that 'the pallium was used in Gregory's time for four purposes: 1. As a personal mark of honour to some bishops, not necessarily metropolitans, without any idea of conveying jurisdiction. 2. Regularly sent to occupants of at least three suffragan sees within that suburbicarian region in which the Roman Bishop was sole Metropolitan. 3. Given to the occupants of certain metropolitical sees, along with a grant, not of metropolitical, but of vicarial jurisdiction. 4. Sent as a matter of custom to some metropolitan bishops (*pallium honores*).' And he gives instances of all four uses ('Augustine and his Companions,' appendix, p. 194, etc.).

[1] Gregory at first intended London to be the Metropolitan see; but London was not within the dominions of Ethelbert, and therefore was, of course, not available.

trees, about those churches which had been turned to that use from temples, and celebrate the solemnity with religious feasting, and no more offer beasts to the devil, but kill cattle to the praise of God in their eating, and return thanks to the Giver of all things for their sustenance; to the end that, whilst some gratifications are outwardly permitted them, they may the more easily consent to the inward consolations of the grace of God. For there is no doubt that it is impossible to efface everything at once from their obdurate minds; because he who endeavours to ascend to the highest place rises by degrees or steps, and not by leaps.'[1] He also warned Augustine himself not to be uplifted by the miracles he wrought, about the reality of which he does not appear to have had the faintest shadow of a doubt. And finally he wrote an encouraging and highly practical letter to Ethelbert, whom he evidently regarded as the King of the whole English nation. Ethelbert deserved his thanks, for he had helped the missionaries to the utmost of his power. He actually gave up to them his own royal palace at Canterbury, retiring himself to Reculver; he helped Augustine to recover an ancient Roman church, which became the nucleus of the cathedral church at Canterbury, and, at Augustine's instigation, built a monastery outside the city, which was at first dedicated to SS. Peter and Paul, but which a grateful posterity afterwards called St. Augustine's.

So far the course of the missionaries had been one of unbroken success. But now came the time when Augustine was to perform another part of the commission which Gregory had entrusted to him; and

[1] Bede, book i., ch. xxx.

this proved a failure. It was about the year 603 A.D. that a conference took place between Augustine and some of the British bishops at a place afterwards called 'Augustine's Ac,' or Oak, probably in the present Gloucestershire. It is scarcely fair to lay the whole blame, as has sometimes been done, upon Augustine, for what ensued. He had received, as we have seen, the most explicit instructions from Gregory, who had placed the British bishops absolutely under his authority; and in the face of these instructions he could hardly, without distinct disobedience to his master, treat with the British Church as an independent Church, as it claimed to be, and really was. He was, in fact, placed in a most difficult position. It was not likely that the conference would be a success. The Britons were perfectly content with their Church as it was. They had inherited their peculiar customs from their forefathers, who in their turn had received them from the flourishing Church of Gaul. Who was this Italian stranger that he should have his own way in everything, and claim a jurisdiction over them to which he had no title? It would be no recommendation of him that he had converted some of their conquerors who had harried them out of their homes and destroyed, as far as in them lay, every vestige of their religion. Augustine, on his part, would not be inclined to be conciliatory. He evidently regarded the whole British race as barbarians, and approached them *de haut en bas*. Who were these poor, ignorant Britons, that they should set themselves against the customs, not only of the great Apostolical See, but of the Church Universal? He could not condescend to argue with them. Let the matter be brought to a simple issue. He would

show them by a miracle that God was on his side, not on theirs. And then Bede tells us, in perfect good faith, that a blind man—an Englishman, by the way—was introduced, whom the Britons in vain tried to heal, but whom Augustine healed at once. The unbelievers were convinced, but would not give up their ancient customs until they had consulted with their own people.

So a second council was arranged, which was even less successful than the first. At this council the Britons rallied in greater numbers. Seven bishops and a number of monks from the great monastery of Bangor-Iscoed, headed by Dinoth, their Abbot, appeared on the scene. Counsel had first been taken of 'a holy and discreet hermit' as to whether they ought, at the preaching of Augustine, to forsake their traditions. 'If he is a man of God,' said the hermit, 'follow him.' 'How shall we know that?' they said. He replied, 'Our Lord saith, "Take My yoke upon you, and learn of Me, for I am meek and lowly." If, therefore, Augustine is meek and lowly of heart, it is to be believed that he has taken upon him the yoke of Christ, and offers the same to you to take upon you. But if he is stern and haughty, it appears that he is not of God, nor are we to regard his words.' 'And how shall we discern even this?' 'Do you contrive that he may first arrive with his company at the place where the synod is to be held, and if at your approach he shall rise up to you, hear him submissively, being assured that he is the servant of Christ; but if he shall despise you, and not rise up to you, whereas you are more in number, let him also be despised by you.' Augustine, of course, did not abide the test. He had no intention of treating on

equal terms with these *toto divisos orbe Britannos*. They were in darkness, and he had come from the centre of light; *his* part was to enlighten them, *theirs* gratefully to receive the light. But he graciously condescended to waive many points. 'You act,' he said, 'in many particulars contrary to our custom, or, rather, the custom of the Universal Church; and yet, if you will comply with me on these three points, viz., to keep Easter at the due time; to administer baptism, by which we are born again to God, according to the custom of the holy Roman Apostolic Church; and jointly with us to preach the Word of God to the English nation, we will readily tolerate all the other things you do, though contrary to our customs.' But the Britons remembered the hermit, and argued, 'If he would not now rise up to us, how much more will he contemn us, as of no worth, if we shall begin to be under his subjection?' Then Augustine told them 'in a threatening manner, that, if they would not join in unity with their brethren, they should be warred upon by their enemies; if they would not preach the way of life to the English, they should at their hands undergo the vengeance.' And Bede suggests that the slaughter of the monks of Bangor-Iscoed, at the battle of Chester, by the heathen King Ethelfrid, in 613, was an execution of the Divine judgment, and a fulfilment of the prophecy of Augustine[1]—a suggestion unworthy of the pious historian.

In 604 A.D. Augustine consecrated two new bishops: Justus to the see of Rochester, and Mellitus to that of London. In both these places Ethelbert built churches: in London that of S. Paul, and in

[1] Bede book ii., ch. ii.

Rochester that of S. Andrew.[1] London was then the capital of the East Saxon kingdom, and the planting of the Church there was the only instance of the extension of Christianity beyond the limits of Kent during Augustine's lifetime. As in almost every case, the work began with the King. Sabert (Sigebert), King of the East Saxons, was the nephew of Ethelbert, and was no doubt disposed to receive favourably the men who had done so good a work in the neighbouring kingdom of his uncle. He soon became a convert, and is said to have joined Ethelbert in building the Cathedral of S. Paul.[2]

Very soon after the establishment of the two new sees Augustine was called to his rest,[3] his death being preceded about two months by that of Gregory, justly named the Great. To these two men the English Church owes a debt of gratitude which she ought never to forget. The exaggerated estimate which was once taken of the actual work done by them has, not unnaturally, been followed by a reaction. But to Gregory belongs the credit of laying the foundation of the English, as distinguished from the British, Church, and his wisdom was no

[1] So called in memory of the Roman monastery from which Augustine had been sent to evangelize the English.

[2] The legend that Ethelbert and Sabert also built 'the church of the West Minster, dedicated to S. Peter,' is not sufficiently confirmed. The chief authority for it is Gervase of Canterbury, who wrote towards the close of the twelfth century.

[3] There have been conflicting accounts of the date of Augustine's death. Some place it as late as 607, some in 605, some in 604. May 26, 604 A.D., is the date given by Wharton in his 'Anglia Sacra.' Montalembert, however, inclines to May 12, 605. Bede gives the same year. The cathedrals in London and Rochester were probably not completed until after the deaths of Gregory and Augustine.

less conspicuous than his piety in the undertaking. Augustine was of a more mixed character than Gregory; but if on some occasions he showed timidity, on others hauteur, on others lack of judgment and tact, yet the good largely preponderated over the bad. He was the faithful servant of a greater man than himself, and in that capacity did good service.

Before his death Augustine consecrated Laurentius, one of the original mission, to be Archbishop in his room. Laurentius made another attempt to win over the British Christians, and also wrote, in conjunction with the two other prelates, Mellitus and Justus, to 'the Scots, who inhabit the island of Ireland, which is next to Britain' (Bede), inviting them to conformity. But in both cases the overtures were in vain, the Easter question, above all others, blocking the way.[1]

In 616 the Church suffered a grievous loss through

[1] The letter to the Scoti runs: 'To the Lords, our very dear brethren, the Bishops and Abbots throughout the land of the Scoti, Laurentius, Mellitus, Justus, Bishops, servants of the servants of God. When the Apostolic See sent us, as its wont has been in all parts of the world, to preach in these Western parts to the pagan races, it happened that we entered the country before we were properly acquainted with it. We have venerated both the Britons and the Scoti with great reverence for their sanctity, believing that they walked in the way of the Universal Church. But since we have got to know the Britons, we have supposed that the Scoti were superior to them. Now, however, we have learned, by means of Bishop Dagan, who has come to Britain, and of Abbot Columbanus among the Gauls, that they do not differ from the Britons in their manner of life. For, when Bishop Dagan came to us, he not only would not take food with us, but would not even take food in the same guest-house in which we were eating.' Here Bede provokingly breaks off, and we do not know the conclusion of the letter.

the death of King Ethelbert, and also of Sabert, King of the East Saxons. The successors of both lapsed into heathenism, and actively opposed Christianity. Eadbald, the son of Ethelbert, followed the heathen custom of marrying his stepmother (the successor of Bertha), and thus set an example most inimical to Christian morals; while the three young sons of Sabert, who reigned jointly in his stead, were by their frowardness the cause of the temporary subversion of the Church in the kingdom of the East Saxons. They entered, heathens as they were, into a Christian church in which Mellitus was celebrating the Holy Mysteries, and asked, 'Why do you not give us also that white bread which you used to give to our father Saba, and which you still continue to give to the people in the church?' The Bishop replied: 'If you will be washed in that laver of salvation, in which your father was washed, you may also partake of the holy bread of which he partook; but if you despise the laver of life, you may not receive the bread of life.' 'We will not,' they said, 'enter into that laver, because we do not know that we stand in need of it, and yet we will eat of that bread;' and when Mellitus still continued firm, they added, 'If you will not comply with us in so small a matter as that is which we require, you shall not stay in our province.' And they drove him and his followers out.

Mellitus retired into Kent, where he consulted with Laurentius and Justus, and it was decided that they should all withdraw into France, 'designing there to await the event of things,' as Bede rather euphemistically puts it. Mellitus and Justus accordingly deserted their posts, and Laurentius was about

to follow, when one of those events occurred which we can only record, without attempting to explain. The evening before he intended to quit Britain he ordered his bed to be laid in the church of the blessed Apostles, Peter and Paul, and, after many prayers and tears to God for the state of the Church, fell asleep. In the dead of the night S. Peter appeared to him, and, 'scourging him for a long time with Apostolic severity,' asked of him 'why he would forsake the flock which he had committed to him,' and reminded him of his own example when he was in the flesh. If this were all, it might be accounted for as a very natural dream in Laurentius' excited and perhaps conscience-stricken state. But the story goes on that in the morning Laurentius actually showed the scars of the stripes he had received to King Eadbald, and, on the King's asking who had presumed to give such stripes to so great a man, told him that it was S. Peter. The King was so impressed that he abjured the worship of idols, embraced the faith, and was baptized, and continued to be through his life a firm supporter of the Church. He recalled the fugitive bishops, and restored Justus to the see of Rochester; but London, which had always been tenacious of idolatry, refused to receive Mellitus, and the see was vacant, and Christianity was practically dead among the East Saxons, for nearly forty years. Thus, the Church seemed to be going backwards rather than forwards. One kingdom was lost, and no fresh conversion was made to balance the loss. But perhaps within the kingdom of Kent Christianity was striking its roots deeper, if it was not extending its branches wider.[1] The three

[1] A monastery was founded at Dover in 616, and a double

successors in turn of Augustine—Laurentius, Mellitus, and Justus—were good men, though not of the adventurous or heroic type; the incident of Mellitus' firmness in refusing the sacred food to the heathen, and also of his want of firmness in fleeing ignominiously from the kingdom, is significant; it seems to indicate that he had in one sense the courage of his convictions, and yet not the spirit to push them in spite of danger. We gather also from the letter of Pope Boniface to the last of the three, Justus, when he sent him the pall, that their work had been rather that of deepening than of widening, for he lays stress upon 'the *perfection* which your work has obtained.'

In fact, it is not to Kent, but to a distant and far more interesting sphere, that our attention is now for many years turned. In the year 625, Edwin (Eadwin), King of Northumbria, which then extended from the Humber to the Forth, sought in marriage the hand of Ethelburga, daughter of Ethelbert, and therefore sister of Eadbald, the reigning King of Kent, who replied that it was not lawful for a Christian maiden to marry a pagan. Edwin promised that he would allow her, and all who went with her, 'to follow their faith and worship after the manner of Christians,' and that 'he would embrace the same religion if, being examined by wise persons, it should be found more holy and more worthy of God.' The marriage took place, and the Queen went to Northumbria attended by Paulinus, one of the second band of missionaries sent by Gregory in

monastery at Folkestone in 630, of which Eanswitha, daughter of King Eadbald, its founder, was the first Abbess, and some think that the famous Church of S. Mary in Dover Castle dates from the same period.

601, who was consecrated Bishop by Archbishop Justus before he set out on his journey. Edwin faithfully fulfilled the first part of his promise; he allowed the Queen 'to worship God after the manner of Christians,' and Paulinus to win over to the faith whom he could; but he was slow in carrying out the second part, and for more than a year seemed as far from becoming a Christian himself as he had ever been. In the winter of 626-27 he narrowly escaped assassination through the interposition of a faithful servant who sacrificed his own life to save that of his master. In the same night his Queen was safely delivered of a daughter, and Paulinus represented to him that his own escape from death and the safe deliverance of his wife from the great pain and peril of child-birth were vouchsafed by God in answer to prayer. Edwin was so far impressed that he consented that his daughter should be dedicated to God in Holy Baptism; and Eanfled, the newly-baptized infant, lived to be a great saint in the English Church. But Edwin himself still hesitated, partly because he was of a cautious, deliberate temperament, and partly because his proud spirit revolted against the offence of the Cross. Then a dramatic incident occurred, which had at last the desired effect. In his early years he had been a fugitive from the savage Ethelfrid, King of Northumbria, and had found refuge at the Court of Redwald (Rædwald), King of East Anglia. But Redwald had been half persuaded to put the fugitive to death, and Edwin was awaiting his doom, when, in the dead of the night, a mysterious stranger appeared to him, told him that he should not only escape from death, but become a more powerful monarch than any that had been before him, and

asked what return he would be willing to give for his rescue and his exaltation. Edwin promising that he would make a suitable return, the stranger added: 'But if he who foretells so much good as is to befall you can also give you better advice for your life and salvation than any of your progenitors or kindred ever heard of, do you consent to submit to him, and to follow his wholesome counsel?' And Edwin said that he did. The very next morning he was told that he was free to go. Redwald had been persuaded by his Queen not to be so treacherous as to slay or to surrender a guest who had sought the shelter of his roof. So Edwin *did* escape, and years passed away, and he *did* become a more powerful monarch than any that had gone before him; but he thought no more of the stranger who had foretold it all. In vain did Pope Boniface write to him an earnest letter, and also one to Ethelburga urging her to use the influence which a wife alone can exercise to win over her husband; in vain did Paulinus urge him to take the decisive step. Edwin ceased to be an idolater, but a Christian he refused to become, till one night Paulinus laid his right hand upon his head and asked him whether he remembered that sign. Edwin was startled, as well he might be. How did Paulinus know the sign? Bede, of course, has no difficulty in believing that it was supernaturally revealed to him by the Spirit of God; others think that Paulinus was himself the stranger who had given the sign; others, that he had heard of it from some brother Christian. Be this as it may, the result was that Edwin at last inclined to become a Christian. But he must consult his Witan first. So a council was held at the king's southern home, Godmunding-

ham in Deira. He received encouragement from a most unexpected quarter. Coifi, the heathen high-priest, taking, one must own, a very low and selfish ground, argued that the new religion should be embraced simply because he himself had derived little temporal benefit from the old. None had been so devoted to the heathen rites as he had been, and yet others had found more favour with the King than he had found; the gods had evidently abandoned him, so he was quite ready to abandon the gods. A far higher note was struck by another counsellor, one Corman. Instead of the grovelling argument of Coifi, he uttered this beautiful apologue, which breathes the true spirit alike of poetry and of philosophy: 'The present life of man, O King, seems to me in comparison of that time which is unknown to us, like to the swift flight of a sparrow[1] through the room wherein you sit at supper in winter, with your commanders and ministers, and a good fire in the midst, whilst the storms of rain and snow prevail abroad; the sparrow, I say, flying in at one door, and immediately out at another, while he is within, is safe from the wintry storm; but after a short space of fair weather he immediately vanishes out of your sight into the dark winter from which he had emerged. So this life of man appears for a short space, but of what went before, or what is to follow, we are utterly ignorant. If, therefore, this new doctrine contains something more certain, it seems justly to deserve to be followed.' Then Coifi himself volunteered to be the first to attack the gods of which he had been the

[1] Some modern writers absurdly say 'swallow.' But Bede's words are 'unus passerum.' Besides, it was in winter, when swallows are not usually found in England.

chief upholder. Outraging all heathen prejudices, he mounted the King's war-horse, with a spear in his right hand, though it was unlawful for a priest to bear arms or ride any but a mare, and before the amazed people hurled his spear at the sacred images of the gods at Godmundingham. This was decisive.

On April 11, 627—a memorable date, for it was the birthday of the Church in Northumbria—the King was baptized, with all his nobles, at the wooden Church of S. Peter at York, and henceforth became a most powerful and consistent upholder of the Christian cause. Not only did he promote it in his own kingdom, but also in that kingdom in which he had been a fugitive; for he persuaded Eorpwald, King of the East Angles, to embrace the faith, and East Anglia became temporarily Christian. He built a noble stone church, in place of the wooden erection, which was the first predecessor of the glorious minster at York. The fruits of Christianity were seen, as they always *are* seen when it is real, in the improved state of the great Northern kingdom, for 'wheresoever the dominion of King Edwin extended,' it was said with a touch of unconscious poetry, 'a woman with her new-born babe might walk throughout the island, from sea to sea, without receiving any harm'; and other instances of peace and prosperity are given. Paulinus was consecrated Bishop of York by the Archbishop of Canterbury, and the Pope, Honorius, sent him the pallium. He was wonderfully energetic, preaching and baptizing in all parts. He did not confine himself to his own diocese; we find him in Mercia baptizing numbers[1] in the river Trent, preaching the Gospel at Lincoln, where he

[1] 'Multum populi turbam' (Bede).

converted, among others, Blæcca, the city reeve, and building a handsome stone church,[1] which was called after his name, though it was afterwards, by a ridiculous misnomer, as its successor still is, termed S. Paul's. He has also been claimed as the founder of the church from which subsequently sprang the glorious Norman minster at Southwell. But his greatest and most successful efforts were in the neighbourhood of his own Cathedral city. At Catterick in the Dales we hear of him baptizing thousands in the river Swale.

This went on for about six years, and then came a terrible collapse. Paulinus was a missioner rather than an organizer; we hear of no definite system established anywhere. The great preacher simply went about stirring up men's spiritual consciousness with marvellous effect, and persuading them to repent, believe, and be baptized. This was useful—indeed, essential work; but it required to be supplemented by the work of organization, otherwise it could not, and, in fact, did not, stand the time of trial.

There was another cause which led to the partial collapse of the Church in Northumbria. It is not quite fair to say, as has been said, that Paulinus appealed too much to temporal motives. Certainly in his dealings with Edwin he laid the fullest stress on the spiritual side; and there is no reason to think that his effective preaching was anything but 'the Gospel.' At the same time it is obvious that many of the converts were themselves largely swayed by the conviction that Christianity had the promise of the life that now is. Coifi, as we have seen, un-

[1] 'Ecclesiam operis egregii de lapide' (Bede).

blushingly owned that this was the case with him; and Edwin himself appears to have been influenced by the success which had attended him.

Now this was a two-edged weapon, which cut both ways. As long as the tide of prosperity flowed, the cause of Christianity was carried along triumphantly with it; but when it began to ebb Christianity also fell back. In the year 633 King Edwin was slain, and the Northumbrians were utterly defeated in the great battle of Hatfield Chase by Penda, the heathen King of Mercia, in unholy combination with the British King Cadwalla, or Cadwallon, who called himself a Christian, but hated an English Christian more than a pagan. The Northumbrian Church was involved in the ruin. Paulinus himself fled, and though he left a most competent substitute behind him in the person of James the Deacon,[1] whose noble efforts in the apparently desperate cause of the Church are beyond all praise, yet this could not at such a crisis make up for the loss of the head.[2]

The work, however, was soon taken up by men of a different nationality and a different training. To understand how and whence they came upon the scene, we must turn to the secular history of the kingdom. When Edwin conquered Ethelfrid, the two sons of the latter found a refuge among the Picts, where they were instructed in Christianity by the Celtic Church, and were baptized. On the

[1] That is, probably, what we should call the Archdeacon.

[2] It must, of course, be remembered that Paulinus' first duty in Northumbria was to minister to the Queen, for whose sake he had been sent; and he might fairly argue that he was only attending to his first duty when he accompanied her on her enforced flight.

death of Edwin his kingdom returned to its two original divisions, Ethelfrid's son, Eanfrid, reigning over Bernicia, which extended northwards from the Tyne to the Forth, and Osric, Edwin's cousin, over Deira, which stretched southward from the Tyne to the Humber. In order to conciliate the favour of the terrible Penda, both shamefully abjured Christianity. Happily the reigns of both were very short; and while they lasted the real master of the situation was Cadwalla the Briton—the Christian King who fought against Christians. In the memorable battle of Hevenfeld, or 'the Heavenly Field,' fought near Hexham in 635 A.D., Cadwalla was utterly routed by Oswald, son of the heathen Ethelfrid, and brother of the recreant Eanfrid, but himself a true Christian who had never abjured his faith. Indeed, his victory was essentially a victory of faith. With his own hands he held the Holy Cross while it was being planted in the ground, and then cried to his army: 'Let us all kneel, and jointly beseech the true and living God Almighty, in His mercy, to defend us from the haughty and fierce enemy; for He knows that we have undertaken a just war for the safety of our nation.' Hevenfeld was one of the decisive battles in English history. It finally extinguished all hopes of the Britons to regain their lost inheritance in that large part of the island, and it established the Church in Northumbria on a firm footing, from which no subsequent efforts of the heathen could ever permanently dislodge it. Its immediate results were to place on the throne Oswald, the greatest and best King that has yet come before us in any part of England—greater and better than Ethelbert, greater and better than Edwin, worthy to

be ranked with the mythical Arthur and the real Alfred.

King Oswald's first care was to restore Christianity, and for this purpose he naturally applied to that Celtic Church from which he himself had received the blessing. He sent to the monastery which S. Columba had founded in the little island off Mull, now called Iona, but then Hy or Icolmkill, for a missioner to revive Christianity in Northumbria. The first attempt was not successful. The missioner, by name Corman, returned to Iona, declaring that it was useless to attempt to Christianize so barbarous a people. Then rose Aidan, a brother, and asked whether Corman had not been too harsh, and whether he had not forgotten S. Paul's rule, that babes should be fed with milk, and not with strong meat? Then there arose a general cry that the man who had spoken these words was the man that should be sent. So Aidan was consecrated Bishop,[1] and sent to Northumbria.

[1] By whom is not clear; but by a strange inversion of order, both in the Irish and Scottish Churches, it was not unusual for abbots to have authority over bishops in all matters except exclusively episcopal functions. S. Columba, according to the authority of Bede, though only a priest, had bishops subject to him, and his example was followed by subsequent abbots of Iona. Bishops were exceedingly numerous in all the Celtic Churches, and it was not thought at all necessary that they should have dioceses assigned to them. There would not be the slightest difficulty in finding duly-appointed bishops to consecrate S. Aidan, and, though we do not know the details, there is no reason whatever for doubting the validity of his consecration. It is said that S. Bridget always kept a bishop in connection with her monastery to perform the necessary episcopal functions. See Bright's 'The Roman See in the Early Church, and Other Studies in Church History,' pp. 394, 395; 'The

Instead of settling at York, the capital of the kingdom, and the see of the Bishop even from the British times—the place, moreover, intended by Gregory himself to be the Metropolitan see of the North—he established himself at Lindisfarne, or the Holy Island; partly, perhaps, because it resembled in many respects his own Iona, and the resemblance might seem a happy augury; partly because it was the tendency of the Celtic Christians to avoid large cities and to love solitude; and partly because the isle lay almost under the shadow of the rock-fortress of Bamborough, the Northern home of the monarch at whose request he came. There is no spot in all England which is more interesting to the English Christian than the Holy Isle, and none on which he can realize more vividly the Christianity of the past. For the scene can have little altered since the saintly Bishop first landed on its lonely shore more than twelve centuries ago. Then, as now, the fortress of Bamborough, almost unique in its massive strength, was the chief object that met the eye as it gazed on the opposite coast. Then, as now, the Farne Islands would meet his gaze as he turned to the sea on the south, islands which are still happily unpolluted by villas and hotels and other modern abominations, but are sacred to the memory of Aidan and Cuthbert (Cuthberht), who found in their solitude a cherished retreat from the worry of their busy lives. Then, as now, the limitless ocean stretched far away to the east, and then, as now, the Firth of Forth in the dim distance would meet his eye as he turned it towards the north. Holy Island

Celtic Churches in the British Isles;' and Newell's 'History of the Welsh Church,' etc.

is in a very real sense the cradle of the Christianity of a great part of England, and the cradle is very much as it was when it held the great Apostle of the North.

What Oswald was as a Christian King, that Aidan was as a Christian prelate. It is too little to say that the two worked harmoniously together. Oswald helped Aidan in a way that few kings have had the opportunity of doing. Aidan knew little or nothing of the English language, for in those simple times few, and least of all those who had been brought up in the primitive way that Aidan had been, were linguists. Circumstances rather than education had made Oswald master alike of the language that Aidan spoke and of the language that his own subjects spoke. The latter was his native tongue; the former he had, of course, learnt in his long exile beyond the border of Strathclyde. And so he went about with Aidan, acting as interpreter of the glad tidings which he proclaimed. Never was there so happy a union of Church and State. Unfortunately, the union did not last long. At the end of seven years, that is, in the year 642, Oswald fell in battle with the same fierce heathen King, Penda, who had slain his predecessor. The scene of the disaster was Maserfield, probably in the neighbourhood of Oswestry, whose name still perpetuates the memory of the saintly King. Aidan's life was happily spared for nine years longer. His services to the Church were inestimable. He recognised, among other things, the vital importance of training a native ministry, without which a Church can never be more than an exotic in the land; and so he not only drew over monks from Iona, like-minded with

himself, but established a school of twelve boys, of some of whom we shall hear more presently. The death of Oswald was a great blow to him, but it did not make him desert his post. The dominions of the great and good King were again divided, Oswiu, who possessed Oswald's piety, but not his ability, succeeding him in Deira, and Oswy (Oswiu), who possessed Oswald's ability, but not his piety, in Bernicia. The result was what might be expected: Oswy slew Oswin, and succeeded to the whole dominion. It is said that Aidan's heart was broken by the death of Oswin. At any rate, he died within twelve days, breathing forth his pious soul under the shadow of the little church of Bamborough, in the valley below the castle, but being buried, as was meet, in the Holy Island, which he had chosen as the seat of his bishopric. Happily, he was succeeded at Lindisfarne by a like-minded man, Bishop Finan.

Before going back to the history of the Church in other parts of the land, a word must be said about the alleged divergences between the Celtic and the Roman types of Christianity. Those divergences seem to me to have been greatly exaggerated. Both adhered strictly to the doctrines of the Nicene faith, and the very fact that so much stress was laid upon the comparatively unimportant differences as to the time of keeping Easter, the ceremonies connected with the administration of the Sacrament of Baptism, the peculiar form of the tonsure, and the exact measure of respect which was due to the Apostolical See—questions which weigh but as dust in the balance in comparison with the great verities of our holy religion—only emphasizes the substantial agree-

ment between the two systems. The attitude taken by Bede illustrates the same truth, for, while he warmly espouses the Roman as opposed to the Celtic side on the matters in dispute, the impression certainly left by his narrative is that there were no saints like the Celtic saints. Aidan and Oswald and Oswin; and later on Cuthbert and Cedd (Cedda) and Chad (Ceadda) are his real heroes. He writes, indeed, of the Celtic heresy, especially in the matter of Easter, in terms of horror which provoke a smile. But he cannot resist the winning attractiveness of the good men's lives and work. What he says in his own artless language about S. Aidan will apply to the whole subject: 'I have written thus much concerning the person and works of the aforesaid Aidan, in no way commending or approving what he imperfectly understood in relation to the observance of Easter—nay, very much detesting the same . . . but commending . . . his love of peace and charity; his continence and humility; his mind superior to anger and avarice, and despising pride and vainglory; his industry in keeping and teaching the heavenly commandments; his diligence in reading and watching; his authority becoming a priest in reproving the haughty and powerful; and, at the same time, his tenderness in comforting the afflicted and relieving or defending the poor.' And then he owns that Aidan's creed was exactly the same as his own.[1]

Though Northumbria is undoubtedly the central point of interest in the history of the Church in the seventh century, yet most important work was going on in other parts—in fact, the whole land was becoming gradually converted to the faith.

[1] See 'Ecclesiastical History,' book iii., ch. xvii., pp. 136, 137.

Let us begin with that part where the first English converts were made. We have seen how Paulinus fled from Northumbria after the fatal battle of Hatfield, in 633. He took with him the widowed Queen Ethelburga, with her young son and daughter who afterwards married Oswy, King of Northumbria, and brought them safely to her old home in Kent, where a Christian King — Eadbald — was then reigning. There Ethelburga founded and presided over the famous nunnery of Lyming, and there Paulinus found, not only shelter, but a high post, which he was eminently qualified to fill. The see of Rochester had been for some years vacant, and King Eadbald and Archbishop Honorius (whom Paulinus had himself consecrated at Lincoln to the see of Canterbury) agreed that Paulinus was the proper person to fill it. He remained Bishop of Rochester 'until,' says Bede, 'he departed to heaven with the glorious fruits of his labours.' Those labours it would be most unfair to depreciate. He prepared the way for the more permanently successful labours of S. Aidan; and it is only reasonable to suppose that the flourishing state of the Church in Kent during his later life was in part due to him, though the main credit may be given to Archbishop Honorius, and to two successive kings, Eadbald and Erconbert (Earconbert). The latter took an important aggressive step in the interest of Christianity. In the early part of his reign, which lasted for more than twenty-four years (640-664), he commanded the idols throughout his whole kingdom to be forsaken and destroyed, and required the Lenten fast to be observed, 'appointing proper and condign punishment for offenders' (Bede).

Turning westward, we find a most important conversion taking place. The years 634-35 were eventful years in the history of the Church in England. The triumph of the Cross in the North at the ever-memorable battle of Hevenfeld was immediately followed by another triumph—happily a bloodless one—in the South and West. Birinus, possibly, but not certainly, an Italian by birth,[1] petitioned for, and received, a commission from Pope Honorius to go to England for the purpose of spreading the Gospel in those 'inner parts of the land' into which no Christian had yet penetrated. To give dignity and weight to his mission, he was consecrated a Bishop. Landing in Hampshire, he saw that there was no need for him to go farther into the 'inner parts' to seek scope for his energies; for the people of Hampshire, and, indeed, all along to the right and the left of it, from Surrey to the Severn, were 'most pagan' (*paganissimi*). So he set himself to work where he was, and became the Apostle of Wessex. There is a special interest in the conversion of this kingdom, for it included, on the one hand, those places where probably Christianity had first been planted, before Angle, Saxon, or Jute had ever set foot on our soil; and, on the other hand, it became in later ages so much the most powerful of all the kingdoms that it is popularly, though not quite accurately, supposed to have swallowed up all the rest.[2] Unfortunately, there is a provoking silence about the details of Birinus'

[1] Mr. Green calls him 'a preacher from Gaul' ('Short History,' p. 22), but I cannot find on what authority.

[2] Egbert, in his charters, called himself 'Rex Anglorum.' He is generally called the first King of all England; and so he *was*, virtually, but not technically, I think.

work. We are only told vaguely that he went about preaching and baptizing, and that his labours were most successful. As usual, the King of the country was first won over; and here the history of the conversion of Wessex touches upon the history of three other kingdoms—Northumbria, Mercia, and East Anglia.

When Birinus approached Kynegils, King of Wessex, he found a most powerful ally in Oswald, the royal saint of the North, who was visiting the Court with the view of marrying the King's daughter. Attacked by so powerful a battery as the joint efforts of Birinus and Oswald brought to bear upon it, the King's heathenism soon gave way. He was baptized at Dorchester, near Oxford, his future son-in-law acting as his spiritual father, and answering for him at the font. The interesting event is represented on an old font still to be seen at Winchester. By the joint arrangement of Kynegils and Oswald, Birinus was consecrated Bishop of Dorchester, which, as Canon Bright observes,[1] became the parent see of three bishoprics—Lincoln, Winchester, and Oxford —and in that post he remained until his death.

One curious feature in the mission of Birinus is that it seems to have been entirely independent of Canterbury. We can, of course, understand how the mission of Aidan and Oswald in Northumbria had no connection with the see of Augustine; it arose from a different source. But Birinus received his commission from a successor of Gregory the Great, and one would have naturally imagined that he would have connected himself with the successors of Gregory's missioners.

[1] 'Chapters of Early English Church History.'

On the death of King Kynegils in 643 A.D., his son and successor, Kenwalch (Cenwalh), lapsed into heathenism. And now the history of Wessex touches that of two other kingdoms. Kenwalch had married a sister of Penda, King of Mercia, and put her away. The fierce Mercian warrior was the last man to brook an insult to his family. He invaded Wessex, and drove out the King, who found a refuge in East Anglia, where the pious King Anna reigned. Under Anna's influence, Kenwalch became a Christian, and, on being restored to his kingdom, revived Christianity in Wessex. The see of Dorchester was vacant, and Kenwalch gladly accepted the offer of Agilbert (Ægelbyrht), a Frenchman who had been living in Ireland for the sake of improving his theological knowledge, to undertake the charge ; and so Agilbert became second Bishop of Dorchester. Matters went on well for a time, but at last the King, who could speak no language except his own, became weary of what Bede calls Agilbert's 'barbarous tongue.' To relieve himself from the infliction, he determined to subdivide the diocese, and to have as his own Bishop in the royal city of Winchester a fellow-countryman—Wini—who would not offend him by his speech ; and this was the origin of the great see of Winchester.[1]

The subdivision was perhaps necessary, but Kenwalch did it in a high-handed way, without consult-

[1] Mr. J. H. Parker gives a slightly different account. See 'Early History of Oxford' (Oxford Historical Society), ch. v., p. 87. I have followed Bede, as do Canon Bright ('Chapters of Early English Church History,' p. 181), and Dean Bramston and Mr. Le Roy ('Historic Winchester,' p. 8). The accounts, however, both in Bede and in the Chronicle seem a little confused.

ing Agilbert, who took offence, and retired to his native Paris, and was appointed its Archbishop. After a time Kenwalch tried to allure him back; Agilbert declined to come, but sent his nephew, Lothere, or Leutherius, with a strong recommendation; and Lothere became the third Bishop of Dorchester. Thus Wessex became Christian, and its two sees, Winchester and Dorchester—the latter of which was afterwards merged in the new see of Sherborne—were strongholds of the faith.

The scene must now be shifted to that eastern kingdom where King Kenwalch found a refuge from Penda. East Anglia, which embraced the present counties of Norfolk, Suffolk, and part of Bedford, was Christianized during this period. A sort of half-Christianity had been established when that Redwald was King who has been already mentioned in connection with King Edwin. The same Edwin had persuaded Eorpwald, Redwald's successor, to abandon idolatry and embrace the Christian faith; and, as usual, the kingdom followed the lead of its King. But Eorpwald's reign was very short, and, when he was slain by pagan hands, East Anglia fell away from the faith, which it had never really and intelligently embraced. After three years, however, Eorpwald's brother Sigebert gained possession of the kingdom (A.D. 627), and at once set about the task of making his subjects Christians in deed as well as in name. During his brother's lifetime he had dwelt, an exile, in France, and there had been baptized, and had become a pious and intelligent Christian. He perceived that his subjects required much instruction before they could become the same, so he established a school, or, perhaps, several

schools. Felix, a Burgundian, who, as a Frenchman, would naturally sympathize with one who had lived so long and learnt so much in France, came from Kent to help him, and furnished him with teachers from that more enlightened kingdom. Felix was the first East Anglian Bishop; his see, which he held for seventeen years, being at Dunwich, a town on the Suffolk coast, long since swallowed up by the ocean. His work was most successful, and he has been deservedly canonized, and his name held in honour as the greatest saint of East Anglia. But a large share of the success which attended the effort to plant Christianity firmly in East Anglia is due to Fursey, a holy monk from Ireland, who founded the monastery of Burghcastle, and was an extraordinarily effective preacher. Many wild and beautiful legends are told of Fursey; but these are not history. It is not, however, difficult to disentangle from them this element of truth, that, visionary and enthusiastic as he was, Fursey was a true servant of God, who produced a wonderful effect upon the land of his adoption.

Sigebert and Felix appear to have stood somewhat in the same relation to one another as Oswald and Aidan did. But Sigebert did not realize, as Oswald did, that a King can better serve the cause of God by acting as a Christian ruler than by retiring from the world, and so, like other Anglo-Saxon kings, he passed the later years of his life in a monastery, committing the affairs of his kingdom to a kinsman. But he was not allowed to die in peace in his retreat. In 636 A.D. Penda the Mercian made war on the East Angles, who were panic-stricken, as well they might be, at the approach of the formidable pagan;

they felt that no one could lead them to victory but Sigebert, who in earlier times had shown himself a valiant soldier and an able general. So they forced him to lead the troops; but fight he would not; he rode into the battle-field bearing nothing but a simple wand, and the heathen, who knew no mercy, slew him in his defenceless state and scattered his army. He was succeeded by Anna, an equally pious Christian; so the work in East Anglia, which appears to have been very real and deep, suffered no interruption from what one cannot but call the fanatical folly which caused Sigebert's death. Anna's reign, which lasted for nearly twenty years, was a happy one for the Church in East Anglia. But in 654 A.D. he fell a victim to the same pagan warrior who had already slain four kings and routed their armies. Penda had never forgiven him for receiving Kenwalch, as already recorded; he invaded East Anglia; the East Angles fled before the Mercians and their terrible leader 'like timorous sheep,' and the good King Anna fell.

But Penda's own hour was soon about to come. He determined to invade Northumbria, where he had already been twice victorious, and this time to exterminate the whole people, small and great, wiping out the Northumbrian kingdom from the map. King Oswy tried to propitiate him with gifts, but Penda refused to be propitiated; and at last Oswy said, 'If the pagan will not accept our gifts, let us offer them to one who will, the Lord our God'; and accordingly he vowed that if he were victorious he would dedicate his infant daughter, Elfled (Ælfleda), 'to the Lord in holy virginity,' and give 'twelve farms to build monasteries.' He could

not bring so strong a force into the field as Penda brought against him; but this time the battle was not to the strong. On November 15, 655 A.D., at Winwidfield, near Leeds, the great Penda, who had so often led his troops to victory, and whose name had long been a terror to all Christians, fell, as was meet, in the battle-field, and by the hands of Christians. With Penda fell paganism. It was now merely a question of time how long it should be before all England became nominally at least a Christian land.

The immediate result of Penda's death was the rapid conversion of Mercia, which had long been a stronghold of heathenism. Penda had swept away all traces of the work Paulinus had done in one part of his kingdom; but in the closing years of his life he had, at least, connived at a fresh attempt which then began to be made to convert Mercia. It arose thus. Penda had made one of his sons, Peada, a sort of Viceroy of that part of Mercia which was called Mid-Anglia. Peada, being invested with this authority, ventured to seek in marriage the daughter of the great King of Northumbria, Oswy, who stipulated that the suitor should become a Christian himself and also instruct his subjects in the faith. Peada was half inclined to do both of his own accord. There was already a family alliance between these two by far the most powerful houses in England. Alchfrid, a son of Oswy, had married Kyniburga (Cyneburh), a daughter of Penda; and Peada was much under the influence of his brother-in-law, who argued with him so convincingly that he declared he would willingly become a Christian, whether he won the maiden or not; and he was

baptized by Finan, Bishop of Lindisfarne, with all the retinue who had come with him into Northumbria, at the royal village, 'Ad Murum,' that is, 'At the [Roman] Wall.' He then returned home, taking with him four priests, whom Bishop Finan had given to him—Cedda, Adda, Betti, and Diuma—to begin the work of the conversion of Mercia. They commenced it at once, with marked success, and, strange to say, they met with no obstacle from the inveterate heathen, King Penda, who, although he had appointed his son as his deputy in Mid-Anglia, still retained the sovereign power over that, as over all other parts of Mercia. He expressed, indeed, his contempt for false Christians, who did not live up to their profession, but no true Christian would gainsay him in this. It seems, however, not to have been thought safe to appoint a Bishop, as was usually done at the very outset of a mission, while the formidable old man still lived. At any rate, it was not until after his death, when King Oswy for a time ruled over Mercia, that Diuma, one of the four priests imported from Northumbria, was consecrated by Finan of Lindisfarne 'Bishop of the Mid-Angles, as also of Mercia' (Bede), the seat of the bishopric being probably Repton, till it was removed to Lichfield.

The great monastery of Medeshamstede (Peterborough) was a monument of the conjoint labours of Peada and Oswy. It was commenced by Peada and Oswy, and completed by his brother and successor, Wulfere, his other brother Ethelred, and his sisters, Kyneburga and Kyneswitha, joining in the work.[1]

[1] 'A.D. 656.—This year was Peada slain, and Wulfere, son of Penda, succeeded to the kingdom of the Mercians. In his time

The conversion of Mercia was immediately followed by the reconversion of Essex—that kingdom which, next to Kent, was the first to learn, but, alas! also the first to renounce, the doctrine of the Cross. The East Saxons owed their reconversion to the same source from which Northumbria, Mercia and East Anglia (that is, roughly speaking, three-fourths of the whole land) mainly derived their faith. About the year 653, Sigebert, King of the East Saxons,[1] was visiting his brother King, Oswy of Northumbria, who plied him so effectually with arguments derived from the Hebrew prophets against idolatry, and in favour of the one great God of the Universe, that he renounced his idols, and, before he returned, was baptized at Ad Murum, where Peada had been baptized, and by the same Bishop Finan. He begged his host to send someone who could instruct his people in the truth. Oswy knew no one so competent as that Cedd whom he had sent with his son-in-law to evangelize Mercia. Mercia had now less need than Essex of the great evangelist. So Cedd was removed to Essex, and, together with another mission-priest, revived Christianity in that

---

waxed Medeshampsted very rich, which his brother had begun. The King loved it much for the love of his brother Peada, and for the love of his wed-brother, Oswy, and for the love of Saxulf the Abbot. He said, therefore, that he would dignify and honour it by the counsel of his brothers, Ethelred and Menwal, and by the counsel of his sisters, Kyneburga and Kyneswitha, and by the counsel of the Archbishop, who was called Deusdedit, and by the counsel of all his peers, learned and lewd, that in his kingdom were. And so he did.'—Anglo-Saxon Chronicle.

[1] Not, of course, to be confounded with the other Sigebert, King of the East Angles.

country. It was probably to report progress that he visited his Northumbrian home, where Finan, Bishop of Lindisfarne, was so impressed with the work that he had done that he consecrated him Bishop of the East Saxons. It may seem strange that he had not the grander title of Bishop of London conferred upon him; but London just at that time seems to have belonged to the kingdom of Mercia, though it was generally reckoned as belonging to Essex; and, moreover, it is doubtful whether London, which was long a stronghold of heathenism, would have received him; it had had no Bishop since it refused to receive Mellitus back, half a century before. At any rate, though Cedd is sometimes accounted second Bishop of London, it is clear that he never had that title. His work in Essex was interrupted by a sad incident which illustrates alike the characteristic boldness of the Celtic bishops, and also the tenacity of heathen notions in that part of England. Cedd excommunicated an East Saxon Earl for an unlawful marriage, 'commanding all that would give ear to him not to enter within the Earl's house, nor to eat of his meat' (Bede). In spite of this inhibition, the King went to an entertainment at the Earl's house, and as he was departing, the Bishop met him. 'The King, beholding him, immediately dismounted from his horse, trembling, and fell down at his feet, begging pardon for his offence. But he touched the King, lying in that humble posture, with the rod he held in his hand, and, using his pontifical authority, spoke thus: "I say to you, forasmuch as you would not refrain from the house of that wicked and condemned person, you shall die in that very house"' (Bede). And it fell out according to the saying of

the man of God. For two brothers, his own kinsmen, and one of them the excommunicated Earl, slew the King, giving no reason for their deed, except that he was too ready to forgive his enemies; that is, as Canon Bright no doubt rightly interprets it, they thought that a man who was imbued with the Christian ideas of humility and forgiveness must be too effeminate to rule a nation of warriors.

In all these events, it will be seen that Finan, Bishop of Lindisfarne, took a leading part. He is a man to whom justice has scarcely been done. He not only carried on his saintly predecessor's work in Northumbria, but on the Ignatian principle, 'Where there is no Bishop there is no Church,' he must be regarded as the father of the Church both in Mercia and in Essex, for he it was who gave the episcopate to both kingdoms.

The Gospel net had now enclosed within its meshes by far the largest part of the land. The East Saxons were doubtful, and the South Saxons were still entirely in darkness; but, with the exception of these two small kingdoms, the rest of England was professedly Christian. It therefore became necessary that one rule should be established throughout the Church respecting customs, which, though not in themselves of vital importance, would be productive of great inconvenience if they varied in different places. The chief of these was the question about Easter, which, put shortly, amounted to this: Was the great festival to be celebrated on the first Sunday between the fourteenth and the twentieth day of the month after the vernal equinox, as the Celtic usage was, or between the fifteenth and the twenty-first, as was the usage of the Roman, and practically all the other

Churches of Christendom?[1] This was not the sole point at issue, but it was the main one. An illustration of the inconvenience of differing usages occurred in the Court of that kingdom which was the backbone of Christianity in the seventh century. Oswy, King of Northumbria, had, as we have seen, married a Kentish Princess, who brought with her to her Northern home a retinue of Kentish Christians. Oswy and his subjects followed the Celtic usage, Eanfleda and her attendants the Roman. So one year it naturally happened that, while the King and his party were keeping their Easter festival, the Queen and hers were yet in 'their day of palms,' preparing for the most solemn part of the Lenten fast.

No one was so proper a person to bring the matter to an issue as King Oswy, from whose dominion had proceeded the missioners who had had the giant's share in Christianizing England. So in the year 664 a council was held at the famous abbey on the Yorkshire coast in the place now called Whitby, but then Streanæshalch or Streoneshalh, the Bay of the Lighthouse.[2] The reasons for the choice of this spot are obvious. The monastery was a double one, consisting both of monks and nuns, carefully separated from one another; it was presided over by S. Hild, or Hilda, the greatest of all English female saints; it was the

[1] For a clear and concise account of this wearisome and complicated question, see Archdeacon Perry's 'Student's English Church History,' vol. i., p. 17, note B to ch. i.

[2] So, at least, Bede interprets Streoneshalh = *Sinus Fari*. But since the above was written, Canon Atkinson has published his learned and interesting 'Memorials of Old Whitby,' in which he devotes a whole chapter to the discussion of the meaning of the word 'Streoneshalh,' deciding against the 'Sinus Fari' interpretation.

home of Elfled, King Oswy's own daughter, whom he had dedicated from her infancy to a holy virginity, and who had migrated thither with S. Hilda from the abbey of Hartlepool; it was conveniently situated, at least so far as the twin kingdoms of Deira and Bernicia—both under Oswy's rule—were concerned. Oswy, and his son Alchfrid, who was apparently a sort of sub-King under his father, presided. On the Celtic side were King Oswy himself —but evidently rather doubtful and open to conviction — Colman, the Bishop of Lindisfarne, and Bishop Cedd (who was visiting, as he was frequently wont to do, the abbey of Lastingham, in the immediate neighbourhood of which he was still Abbot, and who acted as interpreter), with apparently the whole Church of Northumbria at their back. On the Roman side, Agilbert (Ægebyrht), then Bishop of Dorchester, who was visiting in Northumbria, Agatho, a priest who was in his company, and two other priests, James and Romanus, Alchfrid, the King's son, and his friend Wilfrid. King Oswy opened the proceedings with some sensible and apposite remarks on the importance of fixing one definite rule for the Church, especially as to the time of celebrating her greatest festival. Colman, as Bishop of the diocese, was called upon first to defend the native use. He argued that their time for celebrating Easter was derived from their pious forefathers, especially from the great saint Columba, to whom they were primarily indebted for their Christianity; that the usage might be traced back to the beloved disciple, S. John, who was the originator of the 'Ephesine tradition,' and that it was unreasonable to expect them to change in deference to the wishes

of foreigners. Bishop Agilbert, as the highest in rank on the Roman side, was called upon to answer Bishop Colman ; but feeling that he was imperfectly acquainted with the language, and that his arguments would necessarily suffer if they reached the audience through the medium of an interpreter, even of so faithful an interpreter as Bishop Cedd, and probably also feeling that there was an abler advocate by his side, he devolved his task upon Wilfrid. Thereupon Wilfrid arose, nothing loath, and for the first, but by no means the last time, carried all before him. He spoke in an unconciliatory, not to say offensive tone. Though the son of a Northumbrian thane, he had travelled much abroad, and had become acquainted with the customs of the more cultivated Churches of Gaul and Rome. He had returned home with something like contempt for the homeliness and insularity of his own Church, a feeling which he took no pains to conceal. He had no difficulty in showing that Colman was quite wrong in claiming the authority of S. John, even assuming that the Ephesine traditions could be traced back to S. John, which they could not. For the Celts were not following the Ephesine traditions ; they were not, in other words, *quarto-decimans*, because they *did* keep their Easter on a Sunday, while the quarto-decimans did not necessarily do so. Then, Northumbrian though he was, he professed to know nothing about S. Columba. He would not apply to him the text, ' Many shall say in that day, Lord, Lord,' etc., because he would rather not speak evil of those of whom he knew nothing. He would rather hope that they had served God sincerely according to their rustic simplicity. But to set the

authority of a remote island, and only a small part even of that, against the authority of the Universal Church, as he himself had seen in Gaul and in Rome, and knew to be in Africa, Asia, Egypt, Greece, and all the world, and to set it against the Prince of the Apostles, was preposterous. And then he thundered forth the text, 'Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it; and to thee will I give the keys of the kingdom of heaven.'

There was a kind of splendid audacity in a young man under thirty years of age addressing his elders and superiors in such a tone as this, calmly patronizing the great saint of Iona as an obscure man of whom he knew nothing, but of whom in his Christian charity he was willing to believe the best —looking *de haut en bas* upon these poor, simple, rustic islanders, who must be excused because they knew no better—which must almost have taken the breath away from the representatives of the Northumbrian Church. There was abundance, also, of unwarranted assumption about his own argument; he would have found it hard to make good what he asserted about S. Peter, but this would not strike any of his audience, for all would have agreed respecting the Prince of the Apostles. But apart from this, his speech must have been highly offensive; and one might have expected the King, who began by being on the Celtic side, to have silenced the presumptuous youth. But Oswy was, perhaps, half inclined already to go over to the other side, as his son Alchfrid, whose abilities he evidently respected, had done. So he decided the matter in a way that sounds like a strange bathos to modern ears. 'Is it,' he asked,

turning to the Bishop of Lindisfarne, 'true that our Lord said to Peter, Thou hast the keys of the kingdom of heaven?' 'Unquestionably it is,' replied Colman. 'And did He say anything of the kind to Columba?' asked the King. 'No,' replied Colman, aghast. 'Then,' said the King, 'I will not go against the door-keeper of the kingdom of heaven, lest haply, when I present myself for admission, he should not unbar the door.'

This settled the matter. The same argument, if argument it can be called, would apply to the tonsure, the chrism in baptism, and any other points in which the Celtic might differ from the Roman customs. Wilfrid had won all along the line; Cedd was converted; the mortified Bishop of Lindisfarne resigned his see, and retired, with a few irreconcilables, to Iona. All the rest conformed to the Roman usages.

The Council of Whitby marked an epoch in the Church. The real battle that was fought was not as to whether the English Church should keep Easter on this day or on that, whether her priests should adopt the circular or the crescent tonsure, but whether native or Roman customs should prevail generally.

It is impossible to help feeling the deepest sympathy with the losing side. The men who were trained on the Iona model had borne the burden and heat of the day; they laboured, and other men entered into the fruit of their labours. For simple modest piety, for purity from worldly aims, for single-minded devotion to duty, for courage, both moral and physical, which enabled them to brave dangers and hardships, and to rebuke boldly vice

and error, in the highest as well as the lowest, without fear of consequences, there were no saints like the Celtic saints. And the people appreciated their worth. We have the unexceptionable testimony of Bede, who was a very bigot on the other side, on this point. Writing of Northumbria just after the Council of Whitby, and of the devotedness and unworldliness of its pastors, he adds: 'For this reason the religious habit was at that time in great veneration, so that wheresoever any clergyman or monk happened to come, he was joyfully received by all persons as God's servant; and if they chanced to meet him upon the way, they ran to him, and, bowing, were glad to be signed with his hand or blessed with his mouth. Great attention was also paid to their exhortations, and on Sundays they flocked eagerly to the church or the monasteries, not to feed their bodies, but to hear the Word of God; and if any priest happened to come into a village, the inhabitants flocked together to hear from him the word of life; for the priests and clergymen went into the village on no other account than to preach, baptize, visit the sick, and, in few words, to take care of souls; and they were so far from worldly avarice that none of them received lands and possessions for building monasteries, unless they were compelled by the temporal authorities, which custom was for some time after observed in all the churches of the Northumbrians.'[1]

But the Church, in this respect like the world, moves on, and it was outgrowing the simple, homely type of religion, aptly typified by the wooden churches with their thatched roofs, of Northumbria. If it

[1] 'Ecclesiastical History,' book iii., ch. xxvi., p. 162.

was to keep in touch with the enlightenment of Western Christendom; if it was to enlist on its side the treasures of art and culture; if it was to have wider sympathies beyond its own little island, the change must have come. The future of the Church in England was virtually settled, and not wholly to its advantage, on that breezy Yorkshire hill. It certainly was a step in the direction of bringing it into subjection to Rome, and, indirectly, of making it more worldly and self-seeking. But the march of events rendered it inevitable.

The work of the Northumbrian saints was not, however, yet done. Some of the very brightest stars in the firmament of the Church, that will come before us in the next chapter, under new conditions, were true and worthy disciples of S. Aidan.

CHAPTER III.

THE EARLY ENGLISH CHURCH.

From the Council of Whitby to the Death of Bede (664-735 A.D.).

Prosperous period — Final conversion of Essex — Change in Northumbria—Wilfrid—Chad—The Church in Kent—Archbishop Theodore—Visitation of all the island—Chad deposed and Wilfrid reinstated at York—Theodore's four objects: (1) organization of synods; (2) subdivision of dioceses; (3) foundation of a parochial system; (4) advancement of learning—Wilfrid's first appeal to Rome—His missionary work in Frisia—Theodore's 'Pœnitentiale'—Bede on the prosperity of the Church under Theodore—Wilfrid driven forth by Egfrid — Conversion of Sussex and the Isle of Wight by Wilfrid—Wilfrid's return to Northumbria—His last meeting with Theodore—Death of Theodore—Wilfrid's second appeal to Rome—His death—Cedd and Chad at Lastingham—Chad at Lichfield—His touching end—Cuthbert at Melrose—In the Farne Island—As Bishop of Lindisfarne—His high repute—John of Beverley—Erkenwald, Bishop of London—Benedict Biscop—Twin monastery of Wearmouth and Jarrow—Cædmon, father of English poetry—Aldhelm, Bishop of Sherborne—Bede—His life, writings, death, character — Foreign mission-work — Willibrord — Boniface, Apostle of Germany.

THE half-century which followed the Council of Whitby was perhaps the most prosperous and eventful period in the whole history of the early English Church. With the exception of one small district, which was soon to succumb, the whole of England was now professedly Christian. The old type of saintliness which sprang from Iona and Lindisfarne

had not yet died out; there were still living examples of it all through the period, to the great benefit of the Church; while at the same time a new element was being gradually introduced—the element which kept the Church in touch with the highest culture; which enlisted all that was beautiful as well as all that was learned in her service; which, above all, introduced that system and organization whereby her isolated communities were welded together into one united body. Hitherto we have heard of the Church in Kent, the Church in Northumbria, the Church in Mercia, etc.; now we begin to hear generally of the Church in England. All this will be best illustrated by details.

The first event, in point of date, that claims our attention is the third, and this time final, conversion of the East Saxons, in the year 665. Essex was now governed by two sub-kings, Sighere and Sebbi, under the overlordship of Wulfhere, King of the Mercians. Sebbi and his part of the kingdom remained firm in the faith, but Sighere turned apostate, and carried his people with him. Then King Wulfhere sent Jaruman, Bishop of Lichfield, with a company of 'priests and teachers,' who restored Christianity on a firm basis, and thus completed the conquest of one out of the two small kingdoms which still held out against the faith.

Our main interest, however, is still centred, at least for a few years, in Northumbria;[1] but it is a

[1] It is only fair to remember that no other kingdom had a Bede; if it had had, possibly its history might have been made as interesting as that of the great Northern kingdom. Bede is, of course, fuller in his details, and more vivid in his descriptions of the Church in that kingdom, in which he spent the whole of his life, than he is elsewhere. But, after making all due allow-

changed Northumbria. The first indication of the change is the removal of the centre of operations from a lonely island to the capital city of the kingdom. There was still, indeed, a Bishop of Lindisfarne; Tuda, a like-minded man with Aidan, having been appointed to the see when Colman, with his irreconcilables, had retired. But York now begins to take its natural place as the metropolis of the Northern Church as well as of the Northern kingdom.

The man who of all others came forth from the discussions at Whitby with flying colours was Wilfrid, now Abbot of Ripon; and he was selected to preside over the great see which had been vacant since the flight of Paulinus thirty years before. He was the last man in the world to be content to bury himself in a remote island, however hallowed by sacred associations. For he loved publicity and outward grandeur, not so much for their own sakes, but because he really believed them necessary for the Church's advancement.

Though a Northumbrian by birth, he was a true child, not of his own humble native Church, but of the stately and magnificent Rome. He at once showed his bent by not being content with the consecration of native bishops, some of whom he would regard as not canonically appointed. He

---

ance for Bede's partiality for and greater knowledge of Northumbria, we may still say with Dr. E. A. Freeman: 'Before the seventh century had passed [surely long before?] Northumberland had become the brightest part of the whole island, the special home of learning and holiness, the cradle of the history of our people, the cradle of the poetry of our tongue' ('English Towns and Districts').

went over to Gaul, where he might be consecrated by bishops about whom he had no doubt, and where the ceremony might be performed with a splendour which he could not expect at home. The consecration took place at Compiègne, A.D. 665, Agilbert, Archbishop of Paris, being the chief consecrator. He was carried in a golden chair by his brother bishops, singing hymns of joy, none but bishops being allowed to touch that chair. He was in no hurry to leave France, and, in fact, lingered much longer than he need have done. When, after the lapse of a year, he *did* return, he was delayed on his road by shipwreck, and by the savage heathen wreckers on the Sussex coast. When at last he reached Northumbria he found, to his dismay, that his place had been filled up. The Northumbrians were weary of waiting for the absentee Bishop, and had appointed in his stead the saintly Chad, who was then Abbot of Lastingham, in the room of his dead brother Cedd, and who had formerly been one of S. Aidan's twelve boys.[1] Wilfrid showed a singularly Christian spirit, in spite of his naturally imperious temperament. He quietly retired to his beloved abbey of Ripon, and afterwards went about exercising his episcopal function where he could, in Mercia, Kent, and other parts. How he was restored

[1] There is a singular interest about the consecration of Chad to the bishopric. He was sent to Canterbury to be consecrated, but finding the see vacant by the recent death of Archbishop Deusdedit, he went on to Wessex, where he was consecrated by Bishop Wini, assisted by two British bishops (A.D. 665). This was the first symptom of any *rapprochement* between the English and British Churches. Unfortunately, it was an isolated instance; nearly five centuries more had to elapse before a full union between the two Churches was effected.

to York will appear when we turn, as we may now do, to the history of one who shares with Wilfrid the foremost place in the history of the Church of England during the latter part of the seventh century.

Since the death of Augustine little has been said of the first kingdom that received Christianity, or of the men who held the first place in the English Church. The fact is, the Church in Kent generally, and the Archbishops of Canterbury in particular, had taken but little part in the development of the Church outside the borders of their own diocese. But now comes a marked change. On the death of Deusdedit, the first native Archbishop of Canterbury, Egbert (Ecgbright), King of Kent and Oswy, King of Northumbria, 'having consulted together about the state of the English Church' (Bede), determined, 'with the consent of the holy Church of the English nation,' to send Wighard, who was chosen to be the successor of Deusdedit, to be consecrated at Rome, partly in order to invest the office with a new dignity, and partly in order that there might be no question about the validity of the consecration. But Wighard died at Rome, in the year 667, before the consecration took place. The Pope Vitalian thereupon wrote to King Oswy (ignoring King Egbert, who was evidently a minor personage), telling him that he would find a fitting successor. Whether he had been requested to do this or not is not quite clear,[1] but we may be quite sure that he would be

[1] But the Pope's letter, as quoted by Bede, certainly seems to me to imply that he had been: 'We have not been able now to find, considering the length of the journey, a man docile and qualified in all respects to be a Bishop according to the tenor of your letters' ('Eccl. Hist.,' book iii., ch. xxix., p. 167).

ready to do anything that would strengthen his claim to be Patriarch of the West. However, we certainly cannot complain; for the choice he ultimately made was a singularly happy one, supplying that which the Church in England then most needed. He first selected Hadrian, a learned monk, who was an African by birth, but was at the time Abbot of the Niridian monastery near Naples. Hadrian pleaded his unworthiness, but recommended another monk, who, however, had not enough physical strength for the office. Then Hadrian submitted the name of yet another monk then in Rome—Theodore, a native of 'Tarsus, a city of Cilicia,' and Theodore was appointed. He seemed an unlikely man; for he really belonged, not to the Western, but to the Eastern Church, whose orthodoxy in the matter of the great Monothelite controversy, which was then raging, was rather doubtful, and he was past the prime of life, being in his sixty-sixth year. The Pope appears to have been a little doubtful; for he stipulated that Hadrian should accompany Theodore into Britain, ostensibly to guide him safely on his journey, for Hadrian knew the regions through which they would have to pass, and Theodore did not, but really to keep him straight in the paths of orthodoxy, for he feared lest he might show symptoms of wandering into the by-paths of that error with which his native Church was thought to be tainted. It seemed, as Archdeacon Perry observes, a strangely haphazard appointment. Theodore was not even ready, so far as his outward appearance went, to undertake the office. As an Eastern, he had received the tonsure which was supposed to be derived from his fellow-citizen, S. Paul,

by which the head was shaved bald, not the coronal tonsure which the Romans derived from S. Peter. So there was, as Bede gravely records, a necessary delay of four months until his hair grew into the proper shape. When he was at last in a fit condition as to his head, he was consecrated by Pope Vitalian, March 26, 668, and set forth, accompanied by Hadrian and Benedict Biscop, of whom we shall hear more presently. The party did not hurry themselves. They were for some time entertained hospitably at Paris by Archbishop Agilbert, who had himself been a Bishop in England, and could, no doubt, give them much valuable information. It was not until the second year after his consecration, when there had been an interregnum of no less than four years at Canterbury, that Theodore arrived; but when he came he more than made up for lost time. He soon proved himself by far the most effective Archbishop who had ever occupied the metropolitan see. In spite of his years, he showed all the energy of a young man, tempered by the experience which age alone can bring. He was spared for more than twenty-one years,[1] during which he wrought nothing less than a revolution in the English Church. Canterbury became in reality as well as in name the centre of English Christianity. He was the first Archbishop whose authority was universally recognised throughout the land, and the Church under Archbishop Theodore became what it had never been before, the Church of England.

Doubtless, circumstances helped him. In every way English Christians were ripe for the change.

[1] Twenty-one years, three months, and twenty-six days, says the accurate Bede.

The Council of Whitby had settled once for all that there was to be only one usage, not varying usages, throughout the land. There seems to have been a general feeling that the great work now to be done was to weld together the scattered communities of Christians into one united Church. What was wanted was, not a saint, but a man of business; England was prepared to welcome a good organizer, and it certainly found one in its new Primate. His very defects, as well as his virtues, were in his favour. He was inclined to be rather autocratic and imperious, and, as we shall see, his high-handed proceedings sometimes provoked rebellion; but he was always able to carry his point, and his point was generally a right one, though it was not always reached in a right way.

Soon after his arrival he 'visited all the island wherever the tribes of the Angles inhabited' (Bede), and in his course made a visitation of Northumbria. The fact itself is significant. No Archbishop of Canterbury had ever ventured to interfere much in the Church affairs of the great Northern kingdom; but North, as well as South, was now ready to admit the authority of him who was at this time Primate of both. And it was no mere visit of compliment that he paid. At York he at once impugned the canonicity of Bishop Chad's consecration, of course on the ground that he had been consecrated by Celtic prelates. The humble-minded man replied with unaffected meekness that he had never thought himself worthy of a bishopric, and was quite ready to resign, and to retire to his beloved Lastingham, which he accordingly did. But Theodore, though an imperious, was not an unjust man; he was quite capable of

appreciating Chad's saintliness, and an opportunity soon occurred of showing his appreciation. On the death of Bishop Jaruman, the spiritual father of Essex, Wulfhere, King of Mercia, applied to Theodore to recommend a Bishop for the vacant diocese of Lichfield. Theodore at once appointed Chad, and having 'himself consummated his ordination anew after the Catholic manner,'[1] sent him to be the worthy successor of the good Jaruman in the great Midland diocese. The question occurs, Why could he not have 'completed what was wanting,' and retained him at York? One obvious answer is that there was already a Bishop of York, about whose consecration Theodore would have no doubt, and who would in his view be more suited to preside over the great Northern see than the humble and saintly Chad. That man was Wilfrid, who was at once reinstated. When we hear of Wilfrid finding

[1] 'Ipse ordinationem ejus denuo catholicâ ratione consumavit' (Bede, iv. 2). 'Per omnes gradus ecclesiasticos ad sedem prædictam plenè eum ordinaverat' (Eddius, 'Vita Wilfridi,' c. xv.). These rather mysterious descriptions probably refer to the fact noted above, that two out of the three consecrators of Bishop Chad were British bishops; perhaps also to the fact that Chad had been appointed to a see not canonically vacant. But whether it is meant that Archbishop Theodore reconsecrated him, or consecrated him conditionally, on the same principle on which provision is made in our Baptismal Service for the conditional baptism of one about the validity of whose former baptism there is any doubt, or whether he merely added some fresh ceremony, I cannot discover. Theodore certainly held that the British Christians were schismatics. 'Those,' he says, in his 'Penitential,' 'who have been ordained by bishops of the Irish or of the Britons, who are not Catholics in Easter and the tonsure, are not united to the Church;' and then he gives various rules plainly implying the invalidity of acts done by such bishops or priests.

York in 'a deplorable state,' the expression seems to cast a reflection upon Chad. Chad was the very last man to neglect what he conceived to be his duty; but one who had been used to the wooden churches and thatched roofs of the Celts would be quite satisfied with what would appear to Theodore and Wilfrid deplorable squalor. York was certainly the second, if not the first, in importance of all the ecclesiastical centres, and, in Theodore's view, would require for its head what Aristotle describes as 'the magnificent man.'[1] Such a man Chad certainly was not, and Wilfrid certainly was. The substitution of Wilfrid for Chad seems to me part of the profound policy which Theodore showed all through his primacy; and, as usual, it was thoroughly successful. Wilfrid managed his diocese with extraordinary *éclat*. King Egfrid (Ecgfrid), afterwards his bitterest foe, was at first his staunch friend, and the devout Queen Etheldreda was entirely under his guidance. He was popular with all classes, and exercised an influence which few subjects had ever done. That influence he employed exclusively for the advancement of the Church; as a good pastor, a church-builder (the nucleus of what afterwards became one of England's most glorious cathedrals was laid by him), and a promoter of choral worship, and in many other ways, he made a deep mark upon his diocese.

Meanwhile Theodore was going on busily and successfully with his work of construction and reform. He seems to have thought that four things were essential to be done, and all of them he did with more or less success: (1) the organization of synods; (2) the subdivision of dioceses; (3) the

[1] ὁ μεγαλοπρεπής. See Arist. 'Ethica Nicom.,' book iv., 2, 5.

foundation of a parochial system; (4) the advancement of learning, especially among the clergy.

1. It must not, of course, be supposed that Archbishop Theodore was the first to introduce the principle of synods into the Church of England. Synods have been a part of the constitution of the Universal Church, and of every true branch of that Church, from the beginning. And they have always been of a threefold character—the diocesan synod, the provincial synod, and the national synod. The diocesan synod is certainly older than the provincial synod, for the diocese existed before the province, which is merely an aggregate of dioceses; and in England, at any rate, both must have been older than the national, for the Church existed before the nation. But in England the matter is much complicated by the very close relationship between Church and State which subsisted in early English times. Hence there were numerous mixed councils, which were partly ecclesiastical, partly civil assemblies; but the line between the functions of the laity and of the clergy was always markedly drawn, and at these mixed councils the clergy were wont to sit apart and resolve themselves, as it were, into a synod when spiritual questions were to be discussed. Thus, the council held at Canterbury, under Ethelbert and Augustine, in 605, was a mixed council; but that held in London the same year, a provincial synod; while the Council of Streaneshalch or Whitby, in 664, was a national synod. So also was the first synod held under Archbishop Theodore at Hertford in 673; for bishops from both provinces were summoned to it, and Wilfrid of York sent proxies, though he did not attend himself. The bishops known to have been

present were Bisi, Bishop of the East Angles; Putta, Bishop of Rochester; Eleutherius, Bishop of the West Saxons; and Winfrid, Bishop of the Mercians. It has been disputed whether presbyters, as well as bishops, were members of this synod; but the evidence in favour of it is very strong:—'Cogit concilium Episcoporum *una cum Magistris Ecclesiæ Pluribus*':—and it is quite certain that of the national synod that preceded it (Whitby, 664), and of that which followed it (Hatfield, 680), presbyters formed part. To the former Bishop Colman was summoned '*cum clericis suis*'; at the latter, on the unimpeachable testimony of Bede, besides 'the venerable bishops,' there were 'very many learned men'; so it would be strange indeed if from the intervening council presbyters were excluded. At any rate, as a rule, it seems to me quite plain that, besides bishops, presbyters, differently chosen at different times, were constituent parts of all synods. Even deacons and laics might attend, but not as real members of the synod. It is one of the most remarkable features of the early English Church, that, though the spiritual and the temporal powers were so closely blended, yet the distinction between them was thoroughly understood. It is extremely difficult to pronounce, in particular cases, whether an assembly was a mixed council or a synod proper; but there is never the slightest difficulty in distinguishing the functions of clergy and laity. After the Conquest, the difficulty of distinguishing between councils and synods is removed, but infinitely worse complications arose, as will abundantly appear in the sequel.

After this not unnecessary digression, we return to Theodore, whose mission was not to originate, but

to organize, systematize, and make more frequent and regular, the synods of that Church which, under his guidance, now became for the first time a really national Church.

In 673 A.D. a national synod was held under his presidency at Hertford. Many important questions were discussed and canons framed; among them it was ordained, by Canon V., that synods should be assembled twice every year ('ut bis in anno synodus congregetur'). The rule was never strictly carried out, but it established the principle that synods should be of constant recurrence. Theodore, like a thorough man of business as he was, had everything put down in writing by 'the scribe Tityllus,' at his own dictation, so that there might afterwards be no mistake about any matter. First, of course, among the 'Capitula,' as Theodore calls them, is that which settles the canonical time of keeping Easter; then follow some resolutions about bishops keeping to their own dioceses, and monks to their own monasteries, which were no doubt intended as a hit at the unsystematic Celtic Church, whose missionary bishops and monks wandered about whithersoever they would. The only point that was not carried was the ninth 'chapter,' concerning the subdivision of dioceses; but this was a point which, synod or no synod, Theodore had set his mind upon carrying, and did carry.

Theodore's next synod was held at Hatfield (Heathfield), in the immediate neighbourhood of Hertford, in 680 A.D., where again a number of practical questions were discussed and settled; it was then again resolved that two provincial synods should be held every year at a place called Cloveshoo,

the site of which is not known, but which was probably near London; but this resolution was never literally carried out. The proceedings of this synod must have allayed any fears at Rome about the heterodoxy of the Eastern Archbishop of Canterbury. The synod expressed its firm adherence to the Nicene faith, distinctly affirmed its belief in the 'two natural wills' in opposition to the Monothelites, and acknowledged the authority of the five general councils, and the Lateran Council held 'in the time of the Blessed Pope Martin.' Another synod was convened by Archbishop Theodore at Twiford, in 685, and others by his successor, at which presbyters as well as bishops were certainly present.

2. In the matter of the subdivision of dioceses, Theodore found more difficulty than in the matter of synods. In dealing with the question he was brought into collision with the other master-mind of the period. Wilfrid had deeply offended King Egfrid—first by persuading his wife Etheldreda to leave her husband and take the veil, and then by lifting up his voice against the King's marriage with Ermenburga, while Etheldreda, who had never been his wife except in name, was yet alive. Ermenburga herself was a yet more relentless enemy. When Wilfrid was thus out of favour at Court, Theodore, in 678 A.D., visited York, and, with the approval of the King, determined to subdivide the diocese of Wilfrid—of all men in the world—without asking the consent of Wilfrid himself. His reason for this high-handed proceeding is characteristic. He knew beforehand that the Bishop of York[1] would not consent, and therefore he took the matter into his own

[1] York was not yet, strictly speaking, an archbishopric.

hands.[1] Wilfrid was not the man to submit tamely to such an insult. But he knew that there was no authority at home to which he could appeal, for the civil and ecclesiastical powers were acting in unison. He therefore took the bold step of appealing to Rome. It was the first time that any such appeal had been made by an English Churchman against the English Church and the English nation. The provocation was great and the circumstances were peculiar. Theodore was the Pope's own nominee, selected as well as consecrated by him, and sent to England under his special auspices. Wilfrid himself had had more to do with Rome than any prelate since the time of Augustine; his conduct on this occasion was unpatriotic, but not unnatural.

He set off for Rome, but was driven by stress of weather into what was then called Friesland. There he stayed the whole winter, striving to Christianize the Frisians. 'He instructed,' says Bede, 'many thousands of them in the word of truth, washing them from their abominations in the laver of salvation.' Thus Wilfrid may be regarded as the first English missionary.[2] At last he arrived at Rome, and laid his case before Agatho, who had succeeded Vitalian in the Papacy. An important synod was

[1] 'Theodore, at Egfrid's request, consecrated at York three new bishops, Bosa, Eata and Eadhaed, who were practically in the room of Wilfrid. They represented the sees of York, Hexham (Lindisfarne), and Lindsey.'—'Historians of the Church of York and its Archbishops,' ed. J. Raine (Rolls Series), preface xxvii.

[2] His work in Friesland was taken up by Willibrord, the next English missionary, during the period which this chapter covers, and still more vigorously by Boniface, as will appear in the next chapter.

then being held at Rome to deal with the errors of the Monothelites. Wilfrid was summoned before it to confess his faith; and it was recorded that 'Wilfrid, the beloved of God and Bishop of the city of York, having referred to the Apostolic See, and being by that authority acquitted of everything, whether specified against him or not, and having taken his seat in judgment with one hundred and twenty-five other bishops in the synod, made confession of the true and Catholic faith, and subscribed the same in the name of the northern part of Britain' (Bede).

He returned home, armed with a Papal Bull to the effect that he was to be restored to his see, and that he was himself to appoint bishops to help him. The decision was an adroit one, for it of course satisfied Wilfrid, while at the same time it did not altogether thwart Theodore's design of having more bishops appointed.

The English were, however, deeply offended. They were quite ready to admit the primacy of Rome as an Apostolical see, but primacy was one thing, jurisdiction in England another. At the same time they felt themselves in an embarrassing position. They did not desire to break off from the centre of Western Christendom, especially just after they had condemned the Celtic Church for differing from Roman usages; and yet they resolved to maintain their national independence. The obvious expedient was to lay all the blame upon Wilfrid for placing them in so awkward a predicament. They assumed, quite gratuitously, so far as evidence shows, that Wilfrid had obtained the decision in his favour by corrupt means,[1] and by this convenient assumption

[1] 'Ut pretio redempta essent scripta.'—Eddius.

they were enabled to evade the delicate question as to the extent of Rome's authority in England. Theodore had already deposed Wilfrid and consecrated Bosa, a saintly man, Bishop of York (that is, the divided diocese of York) in his room; and Wilfrid was now confined in prison for nine months.

Thus Theodore had his way, as he generally had, in the great Northumbrian diocese, which was now divided into four. The Mercian diocese was also 'cantoned' into five—Lichfield, Worcester, Leicester, Sidnacester (or Lindsey) and Dorchester.[1] East Anglia had already been divided into two dioceses—Elmham and Dunwich, and the need of subdivision in other dioceses was not so crying; therefore Theodore may be fairly said to have carried his second point.

3. The establishment of the parochial system was a gigantic task, and Theodore cannot be said to have done more than to have laid down the principles on which it was carried out. The matter is a little complicated by the fact that the term 'parochia,' or parish, was sometimes used to express the Bishop's diocese,[2] sometimes in the sense in which we use it. What Theodore certainly did was to encourage lords of manors to build and endow parish churches by giving them the patronage of the churches thus founded.[3] It was also probably through him that the custom was established of paying part of the tithes to the parish priest instead of giving them all

[1] But for a modification of this view, see Canon Bright's 'Chapters of Early English Church History,' p. 309, etc.

[2] Even as late as 943 A.D. it was so used in the Constitutions published in that year by Otho, Archbishop of Canterbury.

[3] 'Patronum faciunt dos, ædificatio, fundus.'

to the cathedral to be apportioned by the Bishop. It should be remembered that hitherto the cathedrals and the monasteries had done (and done with considerable effect) part of the work now done by the parish priest, sending forth priests to administer the sacraments, preach the Word, and visit the sick over a large area in their respective neighbourhoods.[1]

4. The advancement of learning was effectively promoted by Theodore and Hadrian. Both, but especially the latter, were learned men themselves, and they gave the greatest stimulus, not only to theological, but to general learning.[2] S. Augustine's at Canterbury became, under their influence, and, indeed, personal instruction, the most distinguished seat of learning in the South of England. The contagion spread in all directions. Monasteries became most efficient schools. Aldhelm, at Malmesbury and in the diocese of Sherborne generally, Bosa and his successors at York, must be regarded as

[1] 'It was the custom of the English people,' says Bede, writing of the year 685, 'that when a clerk or priest came into the town, they all, at his command, flocked together to hear the Word; willingly heard what was said, and willingly practised those things that they could hear or understand' ('Eccl. Hist.,' book iv., ch. xxvii., p. 226).

[2] 'Forasmuch as both of them were well read both in sacred and in secular literature, there gathered a crowd of disciples, and there daily flowed from them rivers of knowledge to water the hearts of their hearers; and, together with the books of Holy Writ, they also taught them the arts of ecclesiastical poetry, astronomy, and arithmetic.'—Bede, 'Eccl. Hist.,' book iv., ch. ii, p. 172. Mr. J. B. Mullinger goes so far as to say: 'The impulse given by this ecclesiastic [Theodore] long continued to influence the course of instruction, and in the curriculum he introduced may be discerned the rude outlines of our modern system' ('The University of Cambridge,' Introduction to vol. i., p. 8)

following the lead of Theodore. Music also began to be cultivated, and to lend its attractions to the Church. 'From that time,' writes Bede, 'they began in all the churches of the English to learn sacred music, which till then had been known only in Kent.'

To these four reforms of Theodore, a fifth may, perhaps, be added, viz., his attempt to enforce and systematize Church discipline by the publication of his famous 'Penitential'; but this most important matter is not so closely identified with Theodore's name as the other four; so it may suffice to notice it in passing.

This was, perhaps, the palmiest period in the early English Church. 'Never,' writes Bede, 'were there happier times since the English came into Britain, for their kings, being brave men and good Christians, they were a terror to all barbarous nations, and the minds of all men were bent upon the joys of the heavenly kingdom, and all who desired to be instructed in sacred reading had masters at hand to teach them.'[1] And in writing of the Archbishop's death: 'To say all in few words, the English Churches received more advantage during his pontificate than ever they had done before.'[2]

We must now return to the chequered career of Wilfrid. After his release from prison he was not allowed to remain in Northumbria. In 681 he found for a time a refuge in Mercia, where he built a small monastery; but he was driven from thence through the remorseless enmity of King Egfrid, whom no other King dared to offend, and withdrew into

[1] 'Eccl. Hist.,' book iv., ch. ii., p. 173.
[2] *Ibid.*, book v., ch. viii., p. 246.

Wessex; hither, too, the hostility of Queen Ermenburga, who was even more embittered against him than her husband, pursued him, and 'he turned aside into the province of the South Saxons, where the King promised him his protection.'

The little kingdom of Sussex was the one single spot where heathenism not only lingered, but reigned triumphant, and that in spite of the fact that the King, Ethelwalch (Æthelwalch), and the Queen, Ebba (Æbbe), were both Christians, this being the one exception to the rule that the Anglo-Saxons followed the religion of their sovereigns. Sussex was the near neighbour of the kingdom which had first accepted the Gospel, and which was still the centre of light; but Sussex was cut off by its forests and its marshes from much intercourse with those outside its own borders, and missionaries had tried to convert it in vain. There was one little oasis in the midst of the heathen desert, a small monastery at Bosham, presided over by a Scottish monk called Dicul, but this produced no effect upon the surrounding country. King Ethelwalch, however, had now found the one man who was able to do the work. The wonderful persuasiveness of Wilfrid, which has been already noticed at Whitby, in Friesland, and at Rome, was now brought to bear upon the heathenism of the South Saxons, and not in vain. Wilfrid succeeded where others had failed. He began, as so many missionaries have begun, by winning attention through his superior culture in the arts of this life. There was a famine in the land, and the people had no resources, not even the obvious one of fishing, for they knew only how to catch eels. Wilfrid instructed his followers

'to gather the eel-nets and cast them into the sea, and by the blessing of God they took three hundred fish of several sorts' (Bede). In other words, Wilfrid saved them from starvation by teaching them the art of fishing. And, having thus won their gratitude and confidence, he saved them, as a fisher of men, from spiritual starvation. The King granted him some land in the district of Selsey, and he built a monastery there, and made it the centre of his operations. Thus Sussex was converted through the instrumentality of Wilfrid.[1]

The conversion of Sussex was immediately followed by that of the Isle of Wight, which was the last place in the realm of England to receive the Gospel. The instrument of this conversion was again Wilfrid, who seems to have exercised his marvellous powers of persuasion over the fierce Cædwalla, King of the Gewissæ (West Saxons). For though Cædwalla was not yet himself a Christian, he vowed that if he took the island 'he would give the fourth part of the land and of the booty to our Lord, which he performed by giving the same for our Lord to the use of Bishop Wilfrid.'[2] The date 686 A.D. is thus important, as the date of the final subjugation of the English to the Cross.

But the heart of the Apostle of Sussex (for so Wilfrid may justly be termed) still yearned after his Northern home, and this same year, 686—his relentless enemy, King Egfrid, being now dead—he accepted the invitation of King Alchfrid to return

[1] Wilfrid is sometimes called the first Bishop of Selsey, but the see was not regularly established until the year of his death, 709—that is, twenty-three years after he left Sussex.

[2] Bede, book iv., ch. xvi., p. 199.

to Northumbria, and, after some readjustment of dioceses, was once more reinstated in his old see of York. There is a touching interest in the account of a final meeting between the two foremost Churchmen of the day, who had long been estranged, at the house of Erconwald (Earconwald), Bishop of London, in 686. Both were old—Theodore very old—both had led busier lives and made deeper marks upon the Church than any man of their day, and it is pleasing to think that they were reconciled at last. Theodore died in 690 A.D., but Wilfrid lived on until 709, and had yet some turbulent and exciting experiences to pass through. It seems to me scarcely fair to assume, as has been done, that Wilfrid took advantage of Theodore's death to make an attempt to upset the great Archbishop's arrangements in Northumbria. The fact appears to be that in 691 it was proposed that his diocese should be still further shorn of its greatness by the erection of Ripon into a separate see.

'That was the most unkindest cut of all;'

for Wilfrid loved Ripon more than Selsey, more than York, more than Gaul, more even than Rome. He again appealed to Rome, was again successful there, and again utterly failed to make his countrymen accept the decision of the Pope. He was again banished from Northumbria, and acted for a time as Bishop at Leicester, during the vacancy of the see. In 706 A.D., after the Council of the Nidd, he was allowed to return to Northumbria, not as Bishop of York, but as Bishop of Hexham, with his beloved Minster Ripon attached. But the old man was restless, as well he might be, in his greatly diminished glory in North-

umbria ; his thoughts must have wandered back to the palmy days when he carried all before him at York, when he was the richest and the most magnificent prelate England had ever seen. He wandered about among the religious houses he had founded in Mercia, and died at one of them (S. Andrew's, Oundle) in the year 709.

The absorbing interest which attaches to the lives and work of Theodore and Wilfrid must not make us forget that there were other great Churchmen, more or less contemporary with them, whose lives are in one sense more fascinating than those of the two who, as factors in the making of the Church, tower far above them all. There is a sort of unconscious poetry in the careers of such men as S. Chad and S. Cuthbert which is totally wanting in those of Wilfrid and Theodore ; they present higher types of pure saintliness, and are quite free from the defects which were obvious in the characters of those two great men.

The two brothers, Cedd (Cedda) and Chad (Ceadda), have already been mentioned. Cedd had gone to his rest, but Chad, the younger and more famous of the two, lived on for some years. Both were successively Abbots of Lastingham, the place which Cedd 'chose himself to build a monastery among craggy and distant mountains, which looked more like lurking-places for robbers and retreats for wild beasts than habitations for men'[1]—that is, in the beautiful country in the neighbourhood of Pickering, and not far from the still more famous monastery of Whitby. To this spot both brothers had loved to retire, but both also did active work for

[1] Bede, 'Eccl. Hist.,' book iii., ch. xxiii., p. 148.

Christ in the outer world. S. Chad's name is inseparably connected with Lichfield, though he only presided over the great Mercian diocese for two and a half years. The beautiful tales that are told of him all indicate the great saint rather than the great administrator. Both at York and at Lichfield he would insist upon visiting his diocese on foot, till on one occasion Theodore, who had 'assuredly discovered him to be a holy man' (Bede), lifted him on horse-back with his own hand. Near the Church of S. Mary at Lichfield he built a dwelling for himself and seven or eight brethren, and with them he used to pray and read 'as often as he had any spare time from the labour and ministry of the Word.' He was deeply affected by the convulsions of Nature, and when the wind blew strongly or the thunder rolled, he would always retire into the church and pray to God to spare His people whom He had redeemed. After he had 'most gloriously governed the Church in that province for two and a half years' (Bede), the end came, and its circumstances were in accordance with the whole tenor of his life. A pestilence had broken out which had carried off many of his clergy, and at last attacked the Bishop himself. A certain monk, Owin — himself a remarkable man — who had followed Chad from Lastingham to Lichfield, was working in the fields, when he heard 'the voice of persons singing most sweetly and rejoicing, and appearing to descend from heaven.' The voice, coming from the south-east, drew near him, till it came to the roof of the oratory where the Bishop was. It entered, and then seemed to return to heaven 'the same way it came, within expressible sweetness.' Then the

Bishop opened the window of the oratory and clapped his hands, as his wont was when he desired the monk to come to him; and he said to him, 'Make haste to the church, and cause the seven brothers to come hither, and do you come with them.' When they came he gave them holy counsel, and then added: 'That amiable guest, who was wont to visit our brethren, has vouchsafed also to come to me this day, and to call me out of this world. Return, therefore, to the church, and speak to the brethren, that they in their prayers recommend my passage to our Lord, and they be careful to prepare for their own.'[1] But Owin lingered behind to ask Chad the meaning of the heavenly music; and he said: 'They were the angelic spirits, who came to call me to my heavenly reward, which I have always longed for, and they promised they would return seven days hence and take me away with them.' And in seven days he died (March 2, 671).

Another saint, whose reputation stands higher even than that of S. Chad, and who was also, like Chad, trained in the Celtic school, was S. Cuthbert (Cuthberht). He has been immortalized by Bede in two 'Lives,' one in verse and one in prose, and is, perhaps, the most famous of all the saints of the North. While yet a shepherd lad, Cuthbert had come to the monastery of Melrose[2] (which was then, of course, on the English side of the Border, in the kingdom of Northumbria), having determined to

[1] Bede.

[2] This is Bede's description of Melrose. Mr. Green describes it as 'a group of log shanties in the midst of untilled solitudes, where a few Irish monks from Lindisfarne had settled in the mission-station of Melrose' ('Short History,' ch. i., § 3, p. 25).

embrace the monastic life because he had seen in a vision the soul of S. Aidan carried up to heaven by the angels, and a few days after heard of his death. Eata was then Abbot, and Boisil Prior, and the latter is said to have exclaimed, as he saw the youth approach, 'Behold an Israelite indeed, in whom is no guile,' a description which Cuthbert certainly justified. He surpassed all the other monks in diligence and devotion. He went about from place to place, preaching and teaching, choosing especially the remoter mountain villages, which other teachers disdained to visit; and the rough peasants took all the more heed of him because he had been a peasant lad himself, and could speak to them in their own provincial dialect. He was 'so skilful an orator, and such a brightness appeared in his angelic face, that no man present presumed to conceal from him the most hidden secrets of his heart, but all openly confessed what he had done.'[1] Then he went for a short while to the new abbey of Ripon, but was removed from thence because he adhered to the Celtic usages, and returned to Melrose, where, on the death of Boisil, he was made Prior. The Council of Whitby probably led him, as it led Cedd and others, to conform to Roman usages, and he was appointed Prior of Lindisfarne for the express purpose of bringing this stronghold of the Celtic Church into harmony with the Roman usages. It was a hard task; but Cuthbert, by a happy blending of gentleness, patience, and firmness, at last accomplished it. The monastic rule, however, was not austere enough for him; so, after he had been twelve years at Lindisfarne, he commenced the

[1] Bede.

solitary life, probably in a spot still called Saint Cuthbert's Cave on a southern slope of the Lothians. But even this was not sufficiently desolate for him; so he took up his abode in an uninhabited island, one of the Farne group, just opposite Bamborough, from which it is divided by two miles of ocean. Here he dwelt for nine years in a cell so constructed that he could see nothing but the sky from his window, desiring to look only at heaven, not at earth. Visitors used to come to converse with the holy man and receive his blessing, and here it was his wish to live and die. But in 684 A.D., at the Council of Twiford, in Northumberland, he was unanimously elected Bishop of Hexham. Of course he refused, till at last a deputation, headed by the King (Egfrid) himself, and Trumwin, 'Bishop of the Picts,'[1] went to the island, and persuaded him to accept the office. To make it the more palatable to him, Eata, his old Abbot, who was the Bishop of Lindisfarne, consented to be transferred to Hexham, and Cuthbert was appointed to Lindisfarne, in which diocese the Farne Islands lay. During the short time that he held the bishopric, Cuthbert was a diligent worker; but after two years he felt his end approaching, so he resigned his see, and returned to die on his lonely island. There is no need to describe the dramatic circumstances of his departure, nor the many miracles which were attributed to him in his lifetime, and to his relics after his death. The wonderful reputation which he achieved is certainly not undeserved, so far as

[1] That is, either of Whithern (Candida Casa) in Galloway, or of Abercorn. See Canon Bright's 'Chapters of Early English Church History,' p. 331.

his personal character went, for he was evidently, not only a most saintly, but also a most persuasive and attractive man. But we cannot help feeling that such a life might have a tendency to encourage a morbid and unwholesome craving for *religiositât* rather than religion. How his bones were afterwards removed, first to Chester-le-Street, and then to Durham, will be told in a future page.

Of almost equal reputation for saintliness with the two last mentioned was S. John of Beverley, both in his own day and for many generations later. Unlike S. Cuthbert, he was of noble parentage, and received an excellent education, being one of the many distinguished pupils who were brought up at the school of Canterbury under Archbishop Theodore. Next we find him at the double monastery of Whitby under the Abbess Hilda, and in 687 he became Bishop of Hexham. On the death of Bishop Bosa he was translated to York, but it is with Beverley that his name is inseparably connected. For it was at Beverley, or, as it was then called, 'Inderwood in the Land of the Deiri,' that he founded a monastery, into which, after an episcopate of thirty-three years, he retired until his death in 721 A.D. According to Bede, his miracles almost rivalled those of S. Aidan and S. Cuthbert. We may be sceptical about the miracles, but the fact is worth noting, for it is evident that, in the guileless historian's view, the greater the saint, the greater and more numerous were the miracles that he wrought. As an illustration of the high repute in which he was long held, it may be mentioned that King Henry V. attributed his victory at Agincourt, which was fought on

S. John of Beverley's Day, to the intercession of the saint.

Another famous saint in his lifetime, and for some generations after his death, though now almost forgotten, was Erkenwald (Earconwald), Bishop of London, or, to speak more correctly, of the East Saxons, from 675 to his death in 693. Before he was raised to the episcopate he had founded two of the most famous monasteries of the South, Chertsey, over which he presided himself, and Barking, which he committed to the care of his sister Ethelburga (Æthelburh). All sorts of legends are told about S. Erkenwald, which are only valuable as showing the estimation in which he was held; but if we may once more apply the test of miracles as gauging the reputation for saintliness, this saint will certainly take rank with any that have yet been mentioned.[1]

These are types of saintliness; but the characteristic feature of the Church during this period was rather learning and general culture; and some conspicuous instances of this will be found in the lives of other great Churchmen of the time.

First among them in point of date, and not the last in point of eminence, stands the name of Benedict Biscop, founder of the twin monasteries of Wearmouth and Jarrow. Like many other founders of monasteries, he was of noble birth, being a Northumbrian Thane. In 653 he accompanied Wilfrid in his first journey to Rome, remained there some years, and returned with the full purpose of introducing into his own country the Roman system of Church

[1] See Dean Milman's 'Annals of S. Paul's Cathedral,' ch. i., pp. 10-12; and ch. vii., pp. 151, 152.

life. In 665 he visited Rome again, and passed two years in the monastery of Lerins, an island off the south coast of Gaul, where he became a monk and was thoroughly imbued with the spirit of the Benedictine system. He then went back to Rome for a time, and on his return to England in 669, the new Archbishop Theodore, whom he had accompanied on his journey from Rome, made him Abbot of S. Peter's, Canterbury. There he remained for two years, and then made a third journey to Rome for the purpose of buying books. He returned in 672, and settled in his native Northumbria, striving to instil into his countrymen the principles he had learnt abroad. It was for this purpose that he began, in 674, to build his first monastery, S. Peter's, at Wearmouth. In order that even the outward eye might be impressed with his design, it was built in the Roman style; foreign artists were imported from Gaul, who, among other things, introduced glazed windows, which had never been seen in England before. In 678 he visited Rome again, and brought back with him vast stores of Church furniture for his monastery, and more books, and 'the arch-chanter John,' to teach his monks the music and ritual of Rome. Then he built at Jarrow a monastery dedicated to S. Paul, to be a sort of counterpart of that on the other side of the river; and the two, in fact, really formed one establishment.[1] He himself presided over Wearmouth, but he took an equal interest in Jarrow, and actually made a fifth journey to Rome

[1] And therefore Bede describes himself as 'priest of the Monastery [not monaster*ies*] of the Blessed Apostles, Peter and Paul, which is at Wearmouth and Jarrow' ('Eccl. Hist.,' Conclusion, book iv., ch. xxiv., p. 297).

in order to procure for it books, pictures, and vestments. He died in 689 A.D., one of his last injunctions to his monks being that they should keep firm to the Benedictine rule, which he had himself learnt by visiting no less than seventeen foreign monasteries. Of the type of Churchmanship which secured ascendancy in England at Whitby, Benedict Biscop was at once a remarkable representative and a most persistent and effective promoter.

Contemporary with Benedict Biscop was one who, in a very different way, added to the reputation of the English Church at this period for literary power, viz., Cædmon, 'the father of English poetry.' The dates of his birth and death are uncertain, but as he lived and sang at Whitby during the time and under the encouragement of the Abbess Hilda, he must have flourished between 658 and 680 A.D. He was one of those untaught geniuses on whom the divine afflatus had been breathed. The beautiful legend tells how the unlettered cowherd shrank from the supper-table and sought his chamber lest he should be called upon to sing, and how he dreamt that he was visited by One who said, 'Sing, Cædmon, some song to me;' and he replied, 'I cannot sing; for this cause left I the feast and came hither.' He who talked with him said, 'However that be, you shall sing to me;' and he said, 'What shall I sing?' and the visitant replied, 'The beginning of created things.' The next morning he told his dream to the Abbess, who perceived 'that heavenly grace had been conferred upon him by the Lord,' and bade him put a passage of Holy Writ into verse; and at last the whole of the sacred story was put by him into verse. He could compose nothing but religious poetry, but

in this he stood supreme. 'Others after him strove to compose religious poems, but none could compete with him, for he learnt the art of poetry, not from men, but from God.' One is loath to cast a doubt upon so sweet a story, which Bede repeated, as it was generally current in his own day; but it bears a suspicious resemblance to stories which are told of others who possessed, what no art can teach, the divine gift of poesy. But there can be no reasonable doubt that he *was* a poet—born, not made—and that he exercised his gift on the highest of all subjects, and thus was a glory of the Church of his day.

We stand on firmer ground when we touch upon the history of another literary churchman of the period, whose fame was quite unique, Aldhelm, second Abbot of Malmesbury, and first Bishop of Sherborne. Few men of his time helped the progress of the Church in so many and various ways as Bishop Aldhelm did. In the first place, he conferred a lustre upon the Church by his intellectual attainments, being universally regarded as the first scholar of his age, in an unusual variety of subjects.[1] He received his education, first at Malmesbury, under the Abbot and founder Maidulf, whose successor he afterwards became, and then at Canterbury, under the direct superintendence of Theodore and Hadrian. His compositions, still extant, are perhaps rather

[1] 'Miro denique modo gratiæ [? Graiæ] facundiæ omnia idiomata scibat et quasi Græcus natione: scriptis et verbis pronuntiabat Prophetarum exempla, Davidis psalmos, Salamonis tria volumina, Hebraicis literis beni novit, et legem Mosaicam' ('Aldhelme Vita auctore Faricio;' quoted in his 'History of the University of Cambridge,' vol. i., Introduction, p. 9, by Mr. J. B. Mullinger, who ranks Aldhelm with Theodore as a promoter of education).

disappointing, but about his literary repute there is no doubt. Again, Aldhelm was a most effective promoter of two of Theodore's most cherished projects, the advancement of church music and of church-building. In the first he was himself a proficient; and the story goes that as he went about preaching the Gospel in his own country (Wessex), in order to attract the attention of the people he would first sing to them, and then, when he had caught their ears in this way, would take advantage of the opportunity to instil into them the lessons of Divine truth. He was one of the foremost church-builders of the time, beautiful churches at Malmesbury, at Sherborne, at Bradford-on-Avon, Frome, and Wareham, owing their erection to his instrumentality. Again, it was no small advantage to him, in the work that he did for the Church, that he was unquestionably of a royal stock. Whether he was actually the son of Kentwine, King of Wessex, or the nephew of the still more powerful King of the same province, Ina (Ini), is not quite clear; but there is no doubt that he had great influence over the latter, who refounded the ancient British monastery of Glastonbury, and was a most munificent benefactor of the Church generally, and of monastic institutions in particular. Through Ina he was appointed Bishop of Sherborne, when the great West Saxon diocese was divided; and can we be wrong in assuming that the famous 'Dooms of Ina,' which, though nominally secular laws, were all framed in the interests of religion and the Church[1] (690 A.D.), were largely due to Ald-

[1] By these 'Dooms,' passed by a Witan, it was enacted that the sacred character of the clergy was to be recognised, Church 'scot' to be duly paid, the right of sanctuary to be maintained,

helm's instigation? Once more, Aldhelm was one of the first who interposed with any effect to bring about a union between the Welsh, that is, the old native Church and that which may now fairly be called the National Church of England. The dominions of King Ina, of course, trenched upon the borders of those districts where the remnants of the Britons still lingered on both sides,[1] and there were many (so-called) Welshmen in Wessex itself. A council was held in the year 705, in which it was decided that Aldhelm should be the delegate (to use a modern term) to make overtures to the Welsh. This he did by writing his famous letter to Geraint, the British King of Damnonia (Devon and Cornwall), the result of which was that Geraint and the Britons of Damnonia conformed to the National Church, being converted by his arguments to the now national usages respecting Easter-tide, the tonsure, and other points.[2] It was a great loss to the Church when one

Sunday to be observed by abstention from all work, children to be baptized within thirty days of their birth, etc. The example of King Ina in Wessex was followed by King Wightred in Kent, at Witans held in 692 and 696, King Ina's being probably in 690.

[1] That is, Devon and Cornwall on the south, and what is now called Wales on the north and north-west.

[2] In this letter Aldhelm uses the strongest language in reference to the matters in dispute. The British tonsure is 'the tonsure of Simon Magus'; their observance of Easter at a wrong date is 'most pernicious to souls.' In their exclusiveness and 'abhorrence of communion with us' they 'unhappily imitate those heretics who will needs be called Cathari.' 'Such enormous errors and malignities as these are to be mournfully bewailed with sighs and tears.' The Picts were persuaded similarly to conform five years later by a letter from Ceolfrid, Abbot of Wearmouth and Jarrow, 710 A.D.

who was her faithful servant in such a variety of ways as Bishop Aldhelm was, died, in 709 A.D.

If posterity has not quite endorsed the reputation for literary eminence which Aldhelm enjoyed in his own day, it has thoroughly done so in the case of the last instance to be noticed of the intellectual advancement of the Church in the period before us. On the Feast of the Ascension, May 26, 735,[1] died the venerable Bede at the age of sixty-two. His uneventful life cannot be better told than in his own words: 'Born in the territory of that monastery [Wearmouth and Jarrow], I was given, at seven years of age, to be educated by the most reverend Abbot Benedict, and afterwards by Ceolfrid; and spending all the remaining time of my life in that monastery, I wholly applied myself to the study of Scripture, and amidst the observance of regular discipline, and the daily care of singing in the church, I always took delight in learning, teaching, and writing. In the nineteenth year of my age I received deacon's orders; in the thirtieth, those of the priesthood—both of them by the most reverend John,[2] and by order of the Abbot Ceolfrid—from which time, till the fifty-ninth year of my age, I have made it my business, for the use of me and mine, to compile out of the works of the venerable Fathers, and to interpret and explain according to their meaning, these following pieces.'[3] Then follows a list of his works—no less than thirty-eight in

[1] The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle gives the date 734, others 736; but the best modern authorities are agreed on the date 735.

[2] That is, of course, S. John of Beverley, the Bishop of Hexham.

[3] Conclusion of the 'Eccl. Hist.,' book iv., ch. xxiv., pp. 297-299.

number—and these do not, of course, include those written in the last three or four years of his life.

Few details are necessary to fill in the outlines of this sketch. He seems to have accompanied Ceolfrid to the new house of Jarrow in 684, and there is a tradition, which we fondly hope may be true, that he was the boy who alone was left to sing the daily offices with his master when the monks were swept away by a pestilence. He is said never to have missed a single service at all the canonical hours, 'lest the angels should miss him.' His teaching was no sinecure; 'in the six hundred scholars that gathered round him for instruction, he is the father of our national education.'[1] His voluminous writings are both in prose and in verse, and deal with secular as well as sacred subjects; but all tend to the glory of God and the benefit of His Holy Church. To his contemporaries and their successors his most valuable works were his translations into English of parts of the Holy Scriptures. But to us the priceless treasure which he has bequeathed is the 'Ecclesiastical History of our Island and Nation,' and, next to this, his biographies. Of the 'Ecclesiastical History,' it is difficult to over-estimate the value. Perhaps those alone can fully appreciate its worth whose business it has been to investigate the original sources from which our knowledge of the early Church, and, it may be added, of the mediæval Church in England, is derived. A feeling of utter blank comes over them when Bede's 'History' ends, and they are forced to have recourse to less trustworthy sources of information. It is not criticism, but sheer philistinism, to cavil at the simplicity—

[1] Mr. J. R. Green, 'Short History,' etc., p. 38.

call it credulity, if you will—with which he records in perfect good faith the countless miracles attributed to his heroes; or at the prejudices which he shows against the British, and to a less extent against the Irish or Celtic, Church; or at the artless way in which he connects natural phenomena, such as comets and eclipses, with coming evil. It is quite easy, by the exercise of a little acumen, to disentangle the historical from the legendary, and to make due allowance for the natural prepossessions of a writer brought up in the school of Benedict Biscop. And when this is done, you have not only a most vivid and fascinating narrator, but a most honest and trustworthy guide. The year 731, in which his history closes, is a painfully marked epoch for the historian, for it is the year from which, in the striking language of a later chronicler,[1] 'history slept, and all notice of public transactions was in a manner buried.' The story of his death is of a piece with his life. It is told most vividly and naturally, in a way that carries conviction, by his own pupil, Cuthbert.[2] After describing Bede's last days on earth, Cuthbert tells the well-known tale of his just living long enough to dictate the last 'sentence' of the translation he was making.[3] The boy who was writing at his dictation said: 'Dear master, there is yet one sentence not written.' He answered: 'Write quickly.' Soon after, the boy said: 'The sentence is now written.' He replied: 'It is well; you have said the truth. It is ended. Receive my head into your

[1] William of Malmesbury, 'De Gestis Regum Anglorum.'

[2] Not, of course, S. Cuthbert.

[3] Either of S. John's Gospel or of a 'Book of Notes' by Bishop Isodorus. Cuthbert does not clearly specify which.

hands, for it is a great satisfaction to me to sit facing my holy place, where I was wont to pray, that I may also sitting call upon my Father.' 'And thus on the pavement of the little cell, singing, "Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost," when he had named the Holy Ghost, he breathed his last, and so departed to the heavenly kingdom.' His prayer which forms the concluding sentence of his immortal 'History' was answered: 'And now I beseech Thee, good Jesus, that to whom Thou hast graciously granted sweetly to partake of the words of Thy wisdom and knowledge, Thou wilt also vouchsafe that he may some time or other come to Thee, the Fountain of all wisdom, and always appear before Thy face, who livest and reignest world without end. Amen.'

Bede's life and character resemble far more closely those formed in the Celtic than those formed in the Roman school. We find his prototypes, not in Augustine, or Theodore, or Wilfrid, or his own master, Benedict Biscop, but in Aidan, and Finan, and Oswald, and Chad. The same simplicity and godly sincerity, the same unconscious poetry of word and deed, but blended with far more learning and culture, are his distinguishing characteristics. The type almost passed away with Bede. Indeed, he lived long enough to see and bitterly lament the degeneracy that was stealing in. There is a melancholy interest in his letter to Egbert, Archbishop of York, written shortly before his death, in which he mourns over 'the luxury in living and apparel, the unchastity in many houses unworthy of the name of monasteries, being, in fact, merely secular establishments,' and suggests that such monasteries should

be suppressed, and an increase of bishops and clergy made from their revenues. That such complaints were not uncalled for will appear only too plainly in the next chapter.

But before closing the history of the period which ends with the death of Bede, a word must be said about the work which English Churchmen were doing in the foreign mission-field. In 692 an Englishman named Willibrord commenced his missionary labours in Frisia, where Wilfrid had already broken up the fallow ground. He was raised to the episcopate, and established his see at Witteburg, or Utrecht. About the year 719 his work was taken up by a greater man than himself, who was also an Englishman. In the year 680 was born at Crediton, in Devonshire, the famous S. Boniface, rightly termed 'the Apostle of Germany,' whose original name was Winfred. He early showed the missionary spirit, and in 716 went to Frisia to join Willibrord; but he found the country in an unsettled state, and was not allowed by the pagan chiefs to deliver his message. He therefore returned to the English monastery from whence he had come, but could not rest there; so in 718 he went to Rome, armed with letters of recommendation from the Archbishop of Canterbury (Brightwald), and his own diocesan, Bishop Daniel of Worcester, to seek the sanction of Pope Gregory II., who in 719 laid upon him the work of converting the heathen tribes of Germany. He was eminently successful in his work, and many others came over from England to help him. Bavaria, Hessia, Thuringia, and other parts of France and Germany, felt the influence of his efforts, either as a missionary or as a reformer. He

was for some time an Archbishop without a see, but in 746 he became Archbishop of Mentz, and having founded several monasteries, the most famous of which was that at Fulda, he at last fell a martyr in the country where he had first laboured (Frisia). He was massacred with fifty-one others, one of whom was Bishop Eoban, whom he had himself consecrated to the see of Utrecht, on Whitsun Eve, A.D. 755, as he was preparing to confirm a number of disciples who had been converted to Christianity by his and Bishop Eoban's means.

CHAPTER IV.

THE EARLY ENGLISH CHURCH.

From the Death of Bede to the Death of Alfred (735-901 A.D.).

Influence of the Church—Seats of learning—Canterbury—York: Archbishops Egbert and Albert—Alcuin—Ethelbald, King of Mercia—Offa—Archbishopric at Lichfield—Monastery of St. Alban's—Peter's Pence—Gift of tenths to the Church—Ninth century a dull period—King Egbert—Decay of learning and morals—King Ethelwulf—Swithin—Danish incursions—Lindisfarne Christians and bones of S. Cuthbert—Edmund, King and martyr—King Alfred—His reforms in Church and State—His victories—His wise counsellors—His legislation and literary work—Welsh Church drawn closer to English.

ALTHOUGH Bede had reason to complain in the closing years of his life of the decay of piety and learning, especially in the monasteries, and though the complaints became louder and more general as the years rolled on, yet the Church was still the light and the salt of the land, the one element which prevented it from lapsing into intellectual darkness and into moral corruption. Jarrow, though it had lost its great luminary, still remained a centre of light; but the two chief seats of learning were now to be found at Canterbury and York. In the time of Archbishop Theodore Canterbury began to take

its proper position, which it had never held since the days of Augustine; and though none of the successors of Theodore for two centuries[1] reached to anything like the stature of the great Archbishop, they still filled the post decently, and managed to keep up, more or less, the prestige which Theodore had for the first time established at Canterbury. The schools founded by Theodore and Hadrian were nowhere more successful than at S. Augustine's, where a large proportion of those men who afterwards became lights of Christendom received their education.

What Canterbury was in the South, that, and more than that, was York in the North. York had no magic name like that of Theodore or Hadrian to conjure with;[2] it had to found its own reputation as a seat of learning, and it was quite equal to the occasion. In fact, in individual cases, it rose to a higher level than Canterbury itself; there was no Archbishop of Canterbury between Theodore and Plegmund who could be compared with two successive Archbishops of York, Egbert and Albert, and no scholar from Canterbury at all equal to Alcuin. Egbert was the real founder of the archbishopric, for the short reign of Paulinus cannot count for much; and the intervening prelates were bishops,

[1] Brightwald (693-731), Tatwine (731-734), Nothelm (735-741), Cuthbert (741-758), Bregwin (759-765), Jaenbert (766-790), Ethelhard (793-805), Wulfred (805-832), Ceolnoth (832-870), Ethelred (870-889).

[2] But it had a splendid reputation to fall back upon: 'York, and York alone, among the cities of Britain, has been the dwelling-place of the Cæsars of Rome,' 'the city of Severus and Constantius, the head of all the Britains' (Freeman's 'English Towns and Districts,' pp. 272, 274).

not archbishops. It was at the instigation of Bede that Egbert applied for, and received, the pall, from Pope Gregory III., who thus helped to complete the original scheme of his great namesake.[1] Both from his personal character and from his high birth, Egbert was admirably adapted to fill the post of Archbishop and Metropolitan. Learned, courteous, active, and pious, he was, under any circumstances, a man to make his mark upon the Church; and he had the further advantage of being of the blood royal, Ceolwulf, the reigning King of Northumbria, being his first cousin, and Eadbert, Ceolwulf's successor in 738, his own brother. King and prelate worked admirably together, each in his own province; and under the joint régime, York became a centre of light and leading. It was Archbishop Egbert who founded the cloister school at York, which rivalled, if it did not eclipse, Canterbury itself. He was well supported by Albert, who presided over the instruction of the school, in which the famous Alcuin was first a scholar and then a teacher. In all other respects Egbert was a model prelate. He was lavish in his gifts to the churches of his diocese, most conscientious in his ordinations, and a great encourager of Church music; while his own saintly life gave a high standard both of personal holiness and of clerical activity. His death in 766, after an episcopate of thirty-four years, would have been an irreparable loss, had he not trained a worthy successor in Albert, who appears to have had all the virtues and all the talents of his predecessor, and who fully

[1] It will be remembered that Gregory the Great expressly intimated to Augustine that the Bishop of York was to have the pallium.

kept up the reputation of York during his thirteen years' incumbency of the see. The next two archbishops, who were both named Eanbald, and were both pupils of Alcuin at York, lived in too troublous times, when the glory of Northumbria was departing, to make their influence equally felt. But greater than any Archbishop was the untitled Alcuin, who was born in the very year in which Bede died, 735, a fact which tempts one to say,

> 'Uno avulso, non deficit alter
> Aureus.'

He was a native of York, and was educated under Egbert and Albert at the cloister school, which he afterwards conducted as 'Magister Scholarum.' The turning-point in his life was his journey to Rome, in 781, to procure the pall for Eanbald I. On that journey he met the Emperor Charlemagne, who was then intent upon elevating the literary tastes of his empire, and who at once saw that the scholarly Englishman was just the person he wanted to help him.

With the exception of an occasional visit to England, the rest of Alcuin's life was spent at the Court of Charlemagne, where he became practically 'the minister of public instruction over a greater part of Christendom.'[1] The splendour of his name reflected a glory upon the Church of his baptism, and did much to gain for England the title of 'the Athens of the West.' He died in 804, leaving a reputation which was more widely spread than that of any other Englishman of his day. Among other learned English Churchmen in the eighth century

[1] Churton's 'Early English Church,' p. 168.

were Alkmund, Bishop of Hexham, afterwards canonized, and Eadfrid, Bishop of Lindisfarne.[1]

But, in spite of this reputation which England enjoyed above all other nations, there is no doubt that the Church was exercising less influence for good than she had done during the seventh century. This was to a great extent her misfortune rather than her fault. It was the weak side of that intimate connection with the State, which was a marked characteristic of the early English Church, that it made her influence greatly to depend upon the personal character of the civil ruler. Mercia had now become the dominant power in England, and for no less than eighty years of the eighth century Mercia was ruled by two kings whose influence for evil was, of course, all the greater in consequence of the enormous power they possessed. Each reigned for forty years, Ethelbald (Æthelbald) from 716 to 756, Offa from 756 to 796. It was no palliation to the balefulness of their influence, but quite the reverse, that both professed to have a tender care for the Church and religion. The example of the King spread, first through the Court, and then into the monasteries, which were fast becoming secularized, if not debauched. It is perfectly disgusting—one can use no milder term—to hear that King Ethelbald actually turned nunneries into harems, and that English women, who professed to make pious pilgrimages to Rome and elsewhere, were notorious

[1] It was in the latter half of this century (the exact date is uncertain) that Wales at last accepted the Roman Easter under the guidance of Elbod, Bishop of Bangor, whereby another step was taken towards the ultimate union of the British and English Churches.

throughout Europe for their licentiousness. This fatal separation of morality from religion was begun by the King and carried on by his subjects. Ethelbald in his youth had taken refuge with Guthlac, the famous anchorite of the Lincolnshire fens, and on his accession to the Mercian throne, according to the prophecy of Guthlac, he made a pilgrimage to the shrine in which the holy man's bones were laid, and reared a building over it, which grew into the great abbey of Crowland; but he did not change the evil tenor of his life—at any rate, until later days.[1]

Among other good men who lifted up their voices against these abominations were Alcuin and the great missionary Bishop, S. Boniface, who in their voluntary exile did not forget the land of their nativity. S. Boniface wrote two stirring letters, one to King Ethelbald, commending his good government, but upbraiding him with his vices, and the other to Cuthbert, Archbishop of Canterbury, urging him to exert himself for the reform of the Church, and transcribing for his benefit the canons which had just been framed at a council at Augsburg, under his (Boniface's) presidency. In consequence of these letters, a council was held, in 747, at Cloveshoo. Ethelbald and Cuthbert were both present, with eleven bishops and several presbyters; and twenty-eight canons were enacted relating to the government and discipline of the Church. The council was a provincial, not a national council; neither Archbishop Egbert nor any representatives of Northumbria were present.

[1] Dr. Lingard says that 'long before his death he forsook the follies and vices of his youth' ('History of England,' vol. i., ch. iii., p. 76).

In 756 Offa succeeded Ethelbald, and, in spite of the praise which has been given to him,[1] the change was not of any benefit to the Church; in fact, his great work seems to have been to throw the Church into confusion in more ways than one. Mercia had long held the place which had once been held by Northumbria. Northumbria had a metropolitan see; why should not the far more powerful Mercia have one as well? The Archbishop of Canterbury had more authority than could be safely entrusted to a subject, and was now actually aspiring to the exercise of sovereign power as the feudatory of Charlemagne. If he could be shorn of some of his power, and Offa's influence be enhanced at the same time, a double advantage would be gained. The ingenious device by which this was effected was the erection of a metropolitan see at Lichfield, which was in the centre of Mercia. The project was set on foot about the year 765, but was not completed until twenty years later. Offa first obtained the consent of the Mercian prelates to make Lichfield an archbishopric, and then applied to the Pope—Adrian I.—to confirm the arrangement by sending the new Archbishop, Higbert, the pall. The Pope was not unwilling, but, as usual, he desired to have his *quid pro quo;* and Offa was ready to give it. He not only lavished immense sums of money on objects dear to the Papal See, but consented to receive two legates from Rome to settle the affairs of the English Church, thus giving to Rome what she always

[1] Alcuin commended him as 'studious to promote good morals,' and William of Malmesbury described him as one of those men in whom it is difficult to say whether the good or the bad qualities predominated.

desired—a footing in England. It was in the year 786-87 that Archbishop Jaenbert was summoned by Offa to a council at Calchith, or Chelsea. At that council the two bishops who had come as legates from Rome were present, and affirmed that they were the first priests who had come over from Rome since the days of Augustine. The partition of the Southern Province was arranged. Canterbury was only to retain five suffragan sees, and was to transfer all the property which it possessed in Mercia to the new archbishopric of Lichfield. It may readily be imagined that outside Mercia—and especially in Kent—the new arrangement gave the greatest dissatisfaction. It was so unpopular (involving Archbishop Jaenbert, who had weakly yielded his rights, in the unpopularity) that it lasted for little more than fifteen years. Two more councils were held at Cloveshoo in 800 and in 803; the Archbishop of Canterbury was restored to all his rights, and the archbishopric of Lichfield was abrogated for ever. Both the Pope and the King who had made the arrangement were dead. Kenwulf, the successor of Offa, and a better Christian, wrote to Leo, the successor of Adrian, on the impolicy of rending the see of Canterbury. Archbishop Ethelhard himself paid a visit to Rome, and received from the Pope authority over 'all the churches of England, as of old,' which exaggerated the power of Canterbury as much as the former Pope's decision had diminished it.

Two other instances of the confusion which Offa introduced into the Church occur. As a sort of compensation for his murder of Ethelbert, King of East Anglia, he founded the famous monastery of St. Alban's, on or near the site of the original church

—which had been erected in memory of the proto-martyr, and had been demolished[1] — and gave sumptuous gifts to the church at Hereford, where the saint was buried. And then he is said to have made a pilgrimage to Rome, where he agreed to pay what were called 'Peter's Pence,'[2] for the support of the pilgrims to Rome and of the English school founded there by Ina, King of Wessex; and also to have assigned 'a grant to the Church of all the tenths in his dominions.[3] These two concessions became the cause of endless confusion in the Church. The subject of Peter's Pence was constantly coming up as a source of dispute, of which we shall hear only too much presently; and the gift of tenths has been absurdly described as the origin of the tithe system, the enemies of that system being, of course, delighted to trace it to so disreputable a source; but the latter very important subject will be more conveniently discussed in connection with a later King.

Except at its beginning and at its close, the ninth century presents but few points of interest in connection with the history of the Church. The period was one of incessant wars, partly civil, and partly against the common enemy of all, the Danes, who now began to make their terrible incursions; and men's minds were so engrossed with civil affairs that they had little leisure for ecclesiastical. Wessex had now taken the place, and more than the place, which had been held by Northumbria in the seventh, and

[1] He agreed to do this at a council held at Verulam in 793.

[2] So called because paid on S. Peter ad Vincula Day, August 1, to perpetuate the memory of the discovery of S. Alban's relics, found on that day.

[3] See Collier's 'Eccl. Hist.,' i. 334.

by Mercia in the eighth century. Its powerful King, Egbert, became practically, though not formally, the King of all England.[1] He had little time to devote to ecclesiastical questions, but he was a truer friend to the Church than either of the two great Kings of Mercia had been; he, at least, brought no scandal upon her by his life, as Ethelbald had done, and caused no embarrassment to her by his interference, as Offa had done. He was wise enough to perceive that she might be either a powerful ally or a formidable foe; and so, at a council held at Kingston in 808, he and his son Ethelwulf entered into 'an agreement of perpetual alliance with the Archbishop and Church of Canterbury,' Archbishop Ceolnoth promising 'for himself, his Church, and his successors' —a bold promise—'unbroken friendship to the kings and their heirs,' and the King 'giving assurance of protection, liberty of election, and peace.'

But no royal favour could stay the process of decay in learning and corruption in morals, which was due to the internal weakness of the Church itself. There is a strange lack of great names from the death of Alcuin, in 804, to the accession of King Alfred (Ælfred), in 871; the one event which requires any lengthened notice during that period took place in the reign of Ethelwulf, Egbert's successor. In the year 855, at a council held at Winchester, the King issued a charter, giving a tithe of all his dominions to the Church. There is a little divergence of opinion among the most competent authorities as to what

[1] 'In right of an overlordship which stretched from the Forth to the British Channel, Egbert styled himself "the King of the English" (Green's 'Short History,' p. 42); whether he had any right so to style himself is another question.

Ethelwulf's donation exactly *was;* but there is no divergence whatever as to what it was *not.* 'It had nothing to do with tithes,' writes Bishop Stubbs.[1] 'I must confess,' writes Mr. Kemble, 'it appears to me to have nothing to do whatever with tithing in the legal sense of the word.'[2] After proving this point most elaborately, he gives a homely illustration which puts the matter very plainly. 'We may suppose the squire of a country parish to have let the parson a house, and subsequently excused him a tenth of the rent. This might be a very charitable act, and might be done from very pure religious motives; but it would scarcely be called "tithe" in the pure ecclesiastical sense of that word. This is precisely what Ethelwulf did in Wessex.'[3]

Archdeacon Perry thinks there was a little more in King Ethelwulf's charter than this; but he is quite clear that it was not the origin of the tithe system; and, as he gives his view with remarkable clearness and accuracy, I cannot do better than transcribe his words: 'The fact of the gift of Ethelwulf is undoubted, but what did he give? He could not make a *new dotation* of the tenth of lands and goods, inasmuch as this had been given long before, was probably introduced by Augustine, was certainly regulated by Theodore, was accepted as part of the law of the Church by the Council of Chelsea (787), and had been given by King Offa. . . . But what Ethelwulf seems to have done, was to enact by a formal State ordinance that which was previously the accepted custom and law of the Church, and at the same time give the tenth of his own lands and possessions.

[1] 'Const. Hist.,' i. 228. [2] 'Saxons in England,' ii. 480.
[3] *Ibid.*, ii. 490.

Before this, probably, the Church had but little power of enforcing that which was hers by law and custom. Ethelwulf supplied this power, and made tithes, which had always been the law of the Church, become now also the law of the State as well.'[1]

In this, as in most of his acts, Ethelwulf was probably instigated by one around whose name so many legends have gathered that it is difficult to realize him as a historical personage; but he *was*, and a very important one too. This was the famous S. Swithin, Bishop of Winchester. King Egbert had so high an opinion of Swithin that he entrusted to him the education of his son and future successor; and Swithin acquired so great an ascendancy over Ethelwulf that the King could do nothing unless he had S. Swithin by his side. S. Swithin became what would afterwards be called his Chancellor, but then his 'Referendarius.' As S. Swithin was his guide in ecclesiastical matters, so was Ealdstan, Bishop of Sherborne, in civil. Ealdstan was a high-minded, patriotic statesman, and could be a valiant soldier on occasion. He himself led an army which won a great victory against the Danes.

This introduces us to a new element in English Church history. The incursions of the Danes,

[1] 'Student's English Church History,' i. 94. See also Haddon and Stubbs' 'Councils,' iii. 636. Dr. Lingard, with characteristic caution and modesty, says that the copies of the charter are so different, and the language so obscure, that it is difficult to ascertain its real object; he then gives two or three suggestions as to its purport, none of which identify it with the tithe system (see 'History of England,' vol. i., ch. iii., pp. 94, 95). It is quite clear that the publication of the charter was connected with the incursions of the Danes, which had already commenced, and which will be noticed immediately.

whether or not they were, as the old chroniclers represent them, scourges sent from God for the impiety of the nation, certainly produced in the end, by very rough means, the beneficial effect of bracing the Church up from its spiritual and intellectual laxity. Those savage hordes of heathens were especially hostile to English Christianity, which they regarded as a base desertion of the gods whom they, like the English before their conversion, worshipped. Hence all sacred places were the objects of their most relentless hostility. They sacked Canterbury and York, as strongholds of the Christian faith; they destroyed all the monasteries of Northumbria, beginning with Lindisfarne, Jarrow, and Wearmouth. Ely, Peterborough, Crowland,[1] Bardney, Winchester—in fact, all the most famous religious houses in the land—soon shared the same fate, so that, in the language of Mr. Kemble. 'it is not at all improbable that in the middle of the tenth century there was not a genuine Benedictine society left in England.'[2] These societies had been the chief guardians of learning, and the havoc of the Danes was as fatal to learning as it was to religion. The splendid libraries founded by Theodore, Hadrian, and Benedict Biscop were utterly destroyed, and England seemed destined to relapse into barbarism. But this school of adversity brought out several bright instances of the reality of the Christian faith.

The romantic story of the Lindisfarne Christians is a case in point. Eardulf, Bishop of Lindisfarne, had for twenty years, in spite of distracting civil wars,

[1] There is a full account of the destruction of Crowland Abbey in Abbot Ingulf's 'History of Crowland.'

[2] 'Saxons in England,' ii. 452.

been quietly but faithfully doing his duty in his diocese, and his labours now bore fruit. When the heathen Danes were approaching the Holy Isle, he told his clergy and monks how the great S. Cuthbert had enjoined that, if ever their abode were endangered by heathens, they were to go forth and seek a new resting-place, taking his bones with them, and not suffering them to be polluted by lying in a pagan soil. So, in obedience to the injunctions of the saint, they set forth in sad procession, carrying with them the bones, not only of S. Cuthbert, but also of S. Aidan and S. Oswald. Crowds of Christians, men, women, and children, joined them; and Christian warriors volunteered to protect them. After many adventures amid the Cheviot Hills and in Cumberland, where they were joined by Edred, Abbot of Carlisle, they at last found a refuge in that ancient home of Christianity, Whitherne in Galloway. But Eardulf could not settle so far away from his beloved island home, so at last he fixed his see at Chester-le-Street; and one can well understand how later generations of Northumbrian Christians loved to trace their descent to those who had so courageously protected S. Cuthbert's bier.

Another notable instance of Christian courage was that of Edmund (Eadmund), King of the East Angles, who well deserves his titles of 'saint' and 'martyr.' He might have saved his life from the persecution of the Danes had he consented to abjure the Christian faith, but he preferred death to apostasy; so, after suffering horrible tortures, he met his fate (November 20, 870 A.D.) in a spirit worthy of the best ages of Christianity, and his name is still perpetuated in the town of St. Edmundsbury, where a noble monas-

tery was erected by Canute in his honour, a hundred and fifty years later.

But the true deliverer of the Church and nation, not only from the Danes, but also from the degeneracy into which both had fallen, was not, in name at least, a saint, nor in deed a martyr, but a most pious and able King. It has already been noted how the close connection between Church and State rendered the personal character of the King a matter of vital importance to religion; and we have seen how influential it was for evil during the greater part of the eighth century. We have now a still more signal instance of its influence for good. The year 871 saw the accession to the throne of Wessex of the greatest and best King that ever reigned in England, and his unique character was formed on a distinctly Christian basis. Alfred (Ælfred), the youngest of Ethelwulf's five sons, was stamped with a sort of sacred character from his earliest childhood. When he was but four years of age, he was taken to Rome, and, in the language of his biographer, Asser, the Pope, Leo IV., 'took him to his bishopson and hallowed him to king.' Whatever this may mean,[1] it was not understood to imply that the line of the succession was to be altered, for three of Alfred's elder brothers reigned before him. When he became King, the nation, and still more the National Church, seemed to be in imminent danger of being swept away by the heathen invaders. It may be that at

[1] By 'taking him to his bishopson,' it is merely meant that he confirmed him. 'Hallowed him to king' perhaps means that, after the example of the prophet Samuel, he anointed him to the kingly office, as Saul and David were anointed long before they became actual kings.

the commencement of his reign Alfred was not altogether free from the indulgence of the youthful passions;[1] but if so, this wild stage of his career soon passed away, and he became an exemplary monarch. It is beside the purpose of the present work to dwell on the glorious deliverance which, after many ebbs and flows of success and failure, the great King wrought both for Church and State; but it may be observed that he clearly regarded his war against the Danes as, above all things, a holy war. On the eve of the memorable battle of Ethandune (Escendune), in 878, he reminded his troops that they fought for the honour of God, for the interest of His Church, and to prevent the extirpation of the Christian religion. When the decisive victory was won, with a piety and humanity no less conspicuous than his clear-sightedness and wisdom, instead of slaughtering his foes, he offered them the alternative of either quitting the land in peace, or submitting to Christian baptism and settling in England; and when many preferred the latter alternative, he himself stood sponsor for their Prince Guthrum (christened Athelstan) at the font. A treaty was made, called the Treaty of Wedmore, by which a part of the land was conceded to the Danes, and named Danelagh. It seemed a hazardous policy, but the wise and good King knew what he was doing; there was room both for Danes and English in a land which had become greatly depopulated by civil and Danish wars; and the infusion of this new element not only strengthened the national life, but turned the bitterest foes of Christianity into its friends. Moreover, it was not an alien race that he was admit-

[1] See Lingard, vol. i., ch. iii., p. 105.

ting; the Danes were of the same stock as the English, and the two were much more likely to coalesce than Saxons with Britons, or Normans with either. The same tender concern for the glory of God and the welfare of His Church marked all the acts of the royal reformer. He revived the monastic system, which had all but died out, himself founding two monasteries, one for women at Shaftesbury,[1] and the other at Athelney, where he had first resisted the Danes; and he planted in the monasteries (which monopolized the education of those days) the best scholars he could find, without regard to their nationality: Plegmund and Wenfrith from Mercia; Grimbold and John the Old Saxon from what would now be called Germany; Asser from the land of the Briton; John Scotus Erigena from the North. He put forth a code of laws which was not so much a new one, as an attempt to infuse a Christian spirit into the old laws of the land; and that there might be no mistake about his meaning, he prefaced it with the Ten Commandments—a significant intimation that, in *his* opinion at least, God's Law ranked above man's law. By a wonderful economy of time, he found leisure amid his varied avocations to translate for the benefit of his subjects into their mother-tongue many works, all tending to promote the interests of religion and morality; and he did not hesitate to recast some of them, so as to give them a more distinctly Christian tone. Of these, the principal were the 'Histories' of Bede and Orosius, Boetius' 'Consolation of Philosophy,' portions of the Holy Scripture, and Gregory the Great's 'Pastoral

[1] His own daughter, Ethelgiva (Ælfgifa), was made Abbess of Shaftesbury.

Care.' His preface to the latter work is singularly interesting, as showing the earnestness of the man. He turns fondly back to the palmy days of the English Church, when it was the glory of Christendom for piety and learning; but now, as for learning, 'so clean was it ruined amongst the English people that there were very few on this side the Humber who could understand their service in English; and I think there were not many beyond the Humber;' and as for piety, 'We have loved the name of being Christians, and very few the duties.' Then he gives the obvious reason why translations were necessary; and referring especially to his translation of the 'Pastoral,' he writes with touching humility and frankness: 'When I thought how the learning of the Latin language was decayed through the English people, though many could read English writing, then I began, among other divers and manifold affairs of this kingdom, to translate into English the book which is named in Latin "Pastorale," sometimes word for word, sometimes meaning for meaning, as I learned it of Plegmund, my Archbishop, and of Asser, my Bishop, and of Grimbold, my presbyter, and of John, my presbyter. After I had then learnt it, so that I could understand it so well as my understanding could allow me, I translated it into English; and I will send one copy to each Bishop's see in my kingdom,' etc. Alfred naturally laid great stress on this work, because he thought it of the utmost importance that those who were admitted to the sacred offices, and especially to the episcopate, should be men of a high stamp, both morally and intellectually; and as there were few then who came up to his standard, sees were sometimes kept vacant so as

to call forth the remonstrances of the Pope. But a vacant see is better than an unworthily occupied one; and though a little temporary inconvenience was caused, it was, in the long-run, for the advantage of the Church, as all Alfred's policy was. Some have objected that he leaned too much towards Rome. But was it not natural for him to look to the centre of Western Christendom for help if he desired to revive a dying Christianity in his native land? All his work was done in spite of feeble health, and in much less than the allotted span of human life; for he was never strong, and he succumbed, in 901, before he had reached his fifty-third year, leaving an undying reputation for greatness and goodness which was as universal as it was deserved.

One happy feature of the period before us was the drawing more closely the bonds of friendship, if not of unity, between the English and what we may now term the Welsh Church. This was brought about in various ways. The Welsh looked for, and found, from the great English King protection against the tyranny of their own petty princes; and the kind offices thus rendered naturally inclined them to regard with more friendly feelings the Church as well as the State of England. Again, the incursions of the Danes, who ravaged impartially the churches and monasteries of English and Welsh alike, drew the two Churches together in opposition to one common foe. And, once more, the large-heartedness of Alfred, 'an enlightened ruler who saw in the Church a bond of brotherhood that should knit all nations and people together,'[1] tended to the same result. Alfred took, as we have seen, for his intimate friend and coun-

[1] Newell, p. 161.

sellor, Asser, who was an illustrious Welsh Churchman, and the kinsman of one of the highest dignitaries of the Welsh Church, Novis, Bishop of S. David's, to whom the great King rendered very material service. The appointment of Asser to the bishopric of Sherborne helped to break down the barrier between English and Welsh Christianity, and we find from this time several instances of the consecration of Welsh bishops by Archbishops of Canterbury.

CHAPTER V.

THE EARLY ENGLISH CHURCH.

From the Death of Alfred to the Norman Conquest (901-1066).

Edward the Elder—Archbishop Plegmund—Vacant sees filled—A West Welsh see founded—Restoration of monastic rule—Archbishop Odo—S. Dunstan—Abbot of Glastonbury—Connection with Kings Athelstan, Edmund, Edred, Edwy, Edgar, Edward, and Ethelred—Dunstan's statesmanship—Legends about him—Ethelwold, Bishop of Winchester—Oswald, Bishop of Worcester—Chancellor Thurkitul—Bribing off the Danes—Elfric the Grammarian—S. Alphege—His glorious end—King Canute—His services to the Church—King Edward the Confessor—His good and bad qualities—Alien priories—Robert of Jumièges and Stigand—Appeal to Rome—Harold—Waltham—Westminster Abbey—National character of the Church before the Conquest—Its harmony with the State—A link between different classes—Education of the people—Its weak points—Its attractiveness and the causes.

THE stimulus given by the great King to Church life and work told in many ways. The son of such a man as Alfred, who was as conscientious in his family relations as he was in every relation of life, naturally took his father's advisers as his guides in religious affairs. Archbishop Plegmund, who survived his royal pupil and master for thirteen years, was as wise and faithful a director to the son as he had been to the father; and the new King, Edward (Eadward) called the Elder, and the Archbishop strove to maintain the high standard of Church life

which Alfred had set before them. Grimbold and Asser, too, were still by the King's side, and helped to prevent him from forgetting Church interests, as in the incessant struggles against the Danes, who had risen in hostility in Mercia and Northumbria, he might have been tempted to do. The first ecclesiastical event was the filling up of the vacant sees, Winchester, Sherborne, and Selsey; Winchester was subdivided, Berkshire and Wiltshire being formed into a new see, with its centre at Ramsbury. Two other new sees were also erected—Wells and Crediton. But while Wessex was forming new dioceses, other parts of the land were losing old ones. In East Anglia the see of Dunwich disappeared, and that of Elmham had only a broken succession. That of Lindsey is never heard of,[1] and that of Leicester is removed to Dorchester, so as to be near the protection of the all-powerful Wessex, which was the centre of ecclesiastical as of civil life. A singularly interesting feature of the time was the formation of a diocese among the West Welsh in Cornwall, which was attached to the province of Canterbury in the time of Athelstan, who also dedicated churches and colleges in Dorset and Devon to Welsh saints. This was one of the first approaches to the amalgamation of the ancient British with the English Church, which afterwards took place with the full consent of the former. But, after all, both Edward and his son

[1] If, as is more than probable, Stow is the site of the ancient Sidnacester, the first 'bishop's stool' of the Lindsey see, then we know that its church was burnt by the Danes in 870 A.D., and that, being as it were on the highroad of the Danish incursions, it was thought unsafe to re-erect it, or to make it the seat of a bishopric. The Lindsey see was absorbed in that of Dorchester.

Athelstan were bound to give their chief attention to war, and the recrudescence of the Danish troubles renders the first forty years of the tenth century a comparatively barren period.

But in 942 there succeeded to the chair of Augustine one whose name introduces us to that which was the great feature of the Church history of the tenth century, the reform of the monasteries—in other words, to the contest between the seculars and the regulars. We have seen how the monasteries, as the chief strongholds of Christianity, had been the greatest sufferers from the havocs of the Danes. Many had been swept away, and those that remained, in a more or less ruinous state, were governed by no fixed rule. Before the troubles a monastery had too often become a mere country house, with a lay Abbot as master of the establishment; at the best it was an educational establishment, and, beyond the cœnobitic life, the monks could scarcely be called monks—certainly not 'regulars,' for what was their rule? On the other hand, the powers of the secular clergy had greatly increased. The bishops had acquired much additional authority by the active part they had taken in civil affairs, and that without losing their ecclesiastical character; for civil and ecclesiastical interests were so intimately connected that it was impossible to distinguish them. It was time for those who desired to restore the old monastic rule to be up and doing; for new monasteries were being built and old monasteries restored, and these, as well as cathedral chapters, were being filled with 'clerks' rather than monks. The first who came to the rescue was Odo, who was appointed to the primacy in 942. He was a converted Dane, and in

his early Christian days had attached himself to the secular party. He had proved his Christian sincerity by cheerfully suffering persecution from his heathen father in consequence of his conversion; but his Christianity did not prevent him from following his military instincts. He was three times in the battle-field after his consecration in 926 to the bishopric of Ramsbury, and in the great battle of Brunanburgh in 937 saved King Athelstan's life—the legend says, by working a miracle. He was therefore a 'secular' in more senses of the word than one. But on his nomination to the see of Canterbury he at once changed sides, affirming that no one was fit to be an Archbishop unless he had first become a monk—meaning thereby one who strictly followed the Benedictine rule. Having no opportunity of seeing that rule carried out in England, he visited Fleury, near Rouen, as one of the nearest monasteries to England where that rule was carried out in its fulness.[1] He returned, a cowled monk himself, and determined to make use of his commanding position to spread the only monachism he thought worthy of the name in that Church over which he was called upon to preside.

He was helped, or, rather, ruled, by one of a more powerful character than his own. This was S. Dunstan (924-988), by far the most conspicuous figure in the history both of Church and State in the tenth century.[2] Dunstan was born at, or near, Glas-

[1] The connection with the monasteries on the Continent was strengthened by the Continental family alliances made by the West Saxon kings.

[2] Dr. Lingard is of opinion that Dunstan 'occupies a disproportionate space in most of our modern histories' ('History of

tonbury, in 924, being of noble parentage connected with royalty. He was educated at Glastonbury, where, although the monastery had fallen into utter decay, there was still a school, owing to the fact of some pilgrims from Ireland having left books, and perhaps teachers, behind them. At an early age he was admitted to the Court of Athelstan, the first of the many kings with whom he was connected; but his various accomplishments seemed so strange to the ignorant young nobles who frequented the Court that they suspected him of using the black arts, and succeeded in procuring his removal. He found a refuge with his relation, Alphege (Ælfheah), Bishop of Winchester, generally called the Bald, to distinguish him from the more famous Alphege, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury. Here Dunstan, after a severe struggle between the flesh and the spirit, was persuaded by the Bishop to devote himself to a religious life. He returned to Glastonbury and practised the strictest austerities as an anchorite; and he also spent much time in working at his favourite mechanical arts. On the death of Athelstan, Edmund (Eadmund), his successor, recalled Dunstan, whom he knew intimately, to the Court, and was much influenced by the counsels of the precocious youth. In 945 the King appointed Dunstan, though only twenty-one years of age, Abbot of

England,' vol. i., ch. iv., p. 131). I am diffident about differing from so competent an authority; but if the facts which I am about to narrate *are* facts, surely a man who was pre-eminent above all others during the reigns of six kings requires a very considerable space in any history of the period. But perhaps Dr. Lingard means that too much space has been devoted to the many, more or less foolish, legends about S. Dunstan. If so, I entirely agree with him.

the royal monastery of Glastonbury. The new Abbot, who, like Odo, had visited Fleury, and had been deeply impressed by the rule of that famous monastery, at once began to reform, or, rather, revivify, the most ancient and famous of all English monasteries. Having succeeded to an ample fortune, he spent his money freely in rebuilding the church and repairing the conventual buildings; and being himself an accomplished handicraftsman, and especially skilled in building organs and casting bells, he worked diligently with his own hands. But his energies were not confined to material work. Without yet introducing the strict Benedictine rule, he reformed his abbey spiritually, and also made it the first educational establishment in the country.[1] The year after Dunstan's appointment to the abbacy King Edmund was slain, and Dunstan conveyed his body to Glastonbury and buried it there. The new King, Edred (Eadred), could not do without Dunstan, who was recalled to Court, and thus became associated with a third monarch. Dunstan was the King's chief adviser, and his Treasurer, a large part of the royal hoard being kept at Glastonbury. Edred was a sickly and short-lived monarch, and Dunstan's influence was paramount. In 953 the King offered him the bishopric of Crediton; but Dunstan, with an impulsive affectionateness which was highly characteristic of the man, declared that while Edred lived he would never leave him. The sole rival in the

[1] Dr. E. A. Freeman rightly terms Dunstan 'the greatest son, the greatest ruler, that Glastonbury ever saw . . . the strict Churchman, the monastic reformer, who called up again the religious life at Glastonbury after a season of decay' ('English Towns and Districts,' p. 101).

King's affections was the Queen-mother; and she and Dunstan went hand-in-hand, both in the work of Church reform, and also in a vigorous policy against the Danes, who were in revolt in Northumbria. But in 955 King Edred died, and was succeeded by Edwy (Eadwig), King Edmund's elder son. This brought Dunstan into connection with a fourth King, but this time with very painful results. The sad story of Edwy and Elgiva (Ælfgifa) need not here be told, especially as it is extremely difficult to decide which is the true version; but the undoubted result was that in 956 Dunstan was disgraced and outlawed. He found a refuge in Flanders, and was deeply imbued with the spirit of the Benedictine rule, which he found fully carried out in the Abbey of S. Peter at Ghent. In 957 he was recalled by Edgar (Eadgar), who bore the title of King of the Mercians, and was consecrated Bishop without any see; but a vacancy occurring at Worcester, he was appointed to fill it, and shortly afterwards to the see of London, holding the two bishoprics together. In 959 Edwy died, and Edgar practically succeeded him. The long reign of Edgar the Pacific was one of the most peaceful and prosperous periods in early English history; and it was mainly indebted to Dunstan, who was a heaven-born statesman, for its peace and prosperity. His influence with the King was unbounded. In the striking language of an early biographer, 'the King believed in Dunstan's counsel as in his own life, and received all that was said by him as though it were spoken by the very mouth of God; and thus he ordained what was to be ordained, and condemned what was to be condemned.' The country was disturbed neither by domestic

broils nor by foreign invasions. 'Scarce a year passed without some public blessing.'[1] The Danes in England were managed as they had never been managed since the days of Alfred. Education was encouraged, and learning flourished under the fostering care of Dunstan, assisted by Ethelwold and others.

One use which Dunstan made of his power was to establish monasteries under the strict Benedictine rule. No less than forty—some say fifty—were founded in England during King Edgar's reign. Least of all did Dunstan forget his own abbey of Glastonbury. King Edgar, who was entirely under Dunstan's direction, 'endowed it with many possessions and immunities. Among these privileges was the power of determining pleas and correcting delinquents; sanctuary within the limits of the hundred; the appropriation of hidden treasures to the use of the monastery; that the monks should always be the electors of their own abbots; and that all controversies whatever, within their jurisdiction, should be determined in the Abbot's court.'[2] The Abbot of Glastonbury had (until the year 1154) the precedence of all the abbots in England. Dunstan had now risen to the primacy, but, monk though he was, and patron of monks, he used no harsh measures in regard to the secular canons in his own cathedral of Canterbury; and, though he strongly objected to married clergy, he did not persecute them. It was,

[1] Edgar, however, was more estimable as a King than as a man. His moral character was far from spotless, and Dunstan dealt faithfully with him, actually condemning him on one occasion to a penance of not wearing the royal crown for seven years, for violating a nun.

[2] 'Monks and Monasteries,' by S. Fox, ch. xv., p. 190.

however, no doubt, part of his policy to connect all the cathedral churches with monasteries and make the monks constitute the chapters, which would naturally ensure the election of monks to bishoprics.

In 975 King Edgar died, and was succeeded, greatly through the influence of Dunstan, by his eldest son Edward, who was the sixth King with whom the great Bishop-statesman was connected. At a council, probably held at Winchester, one of those strange events which have clustered round the name of Dunstan is said to have occurred. A dispute arose, as usual, between the seculars and the regulars, and, as the latter were outnumbered, the former demanded that Dunstan, as Archbishop, should decree 'the expulsion of the monks and the restoration of the clerks.' Then there came a voice from the crucifix which hung in the hall, 'Let it not be so, let it not be so,' and the monks were victorious. But in 978 the question was again raised at a council at Calne, when the floor gave way, and Dunstan alone, or, as some say, Dunstan and his party, escaped, while the others were precipitated below. Whatever may be the explanation of these strange stories, there is no trustworthy proof of any trickery on the part of Dunstan. In the same year (978) King Edward was slain, and Ethelred was crowned by Dunstan; and this was the seventh and last King with whom he was brought into contact. In no respect did Ethelred the Unready show his want of 'rede' more conspicuously than in his dislike of the great statesman who had advised so well his predecessors. Dunstan retired from public life, 'leaving,' as Bishop Stubbs says, Ethelred to mismanage the kingdom as he

chose.' He prophesied that under Ethelred 'such evils should fall on the English as they had never yet suffered,' and his prophecy was abundantly fulfilled; when the master-mind was gone, England became one continued scene of war and rapine. It should be added that, though Dunstan was the confidant of so many monarchs, he never shrank from rebuking them when they acted contrary to his ideas of Christian purity; and though he was a partisan of Rome, he distinctly refused to obey the Pope when he thought him wrong. The last years of his life, which ended in 988, were spent in devotion and in strict attention to the affairs of his diocese.

Dunstan's memory has suffered alike from his friends and his foes—from the former even more than from the latter. Protestant writers have naturally regarded with no favourable eye one who was the great promoter of the Benedictine rule and the advocate of clerical celibacy, and who thereby brought the Church of England more into harmony with the Church of Rome. And Dunstan's panegyrists have really played into their hands; for, by connecting his name with all sorts of improbable legends, they have cast an air of unreality upon his whole life; and by contending for miraculous interpositions in his favour, especially at the Councils of Winchester and Calne, they have given occasion for supposing that he practised impostures, when there is no real evidence of his having done anything of the sort. Again, his advocacy of the reform of monks and clergy has identified him with harsh measures with which he was in no way connected. For, strong partisan as he was of Benedictinism and

celibacy, he was singularly moderate in his own dealings, both with monks not under the rule and with married priests.[1] His conduct in this respect contrasts markedly with that of another great reformer, who was in some sense his disciple.

Ethelwold (908-984), Bishop of Winchester, presents, in his early career, some singular resemblances to Dunstan. Like Dunstan, he was early brought into notice at Court, and became part of the King's *comitatus;* like Dunstan, he was deeply affected by the influence of Bishop Alphege (Ælfheah) the Bald, who is said to have ordained the two to the priesthood on the same day; like Dunstan, he was connected with Glastonbury, being Dean of that monastery when Dunstan was Abbot; like Dunstan, he was a skilful artificer, and worked with his own hands; like Dunstan, he paid great attention to the building and restoration of churches and monasteries; like Dunstan, he threw the whole weight of his influence into the scale of the regulars against the seculars, having been imbued with the spirit of Benedictinism by a visit to the Damnonian abbey of Fleury; like Dunstan, he had the opportunity of framing a monastery after his own model, for King Edred made him Abbot of the monastery at Abingdon, which he restored after its destruction

[1] Dr. E. A. Freeman nobly vindicates Dunstan's character as one 'who stands charged in no authentic record as guilty of any act of cruelty or persecution, but who does stand forth in authentic records as the great Minister of successive West Saxon kings, of successive Lords of all Britain.' 'Let us,' he adds, 'think of him as the friend of Eadmund, the councillor of Eadred, the victim of Eadwig, the friend and guide of Eadgar, the Giver-of-peace' ('English Towns and Districts,' p. 101).

by the Danes,[1] and succeeded in bringing strictly under the Benedictine rule; and Glastonbury and Abingdon were for some time the only two houses in England in which that rule was carried out in its integrity.

But, unlike Dunstan, he cannot be acquitted of severity, nay, actual persecution, in his mode of dealing with the 'clerks' and married clergy. In 963 he was appointed, through Dunstan's influence, Bishop of Winchester. A characteristic story is told of his high-handed doings at Winchester. He walked into the cathedral, bringing with him a number of 'monkish garbs,' and told the canons, who were seculars, either to don them and to conform to their habit, or to resign their posts. Only three conformed, and the rest were ruthlessly turned adrift. Supported by King Edgar, he expelled the 'clerks' out of the great abbeys of Chertsey, Milton, Exeter, Ely, Peterborough, Thorney, and others, and filled them with Benedictine monks. He obtained leave from King Edgar to restore the minsters which had been ruined by the Danes; rebuilt Ely and Peterborough, and peopled them with monks, expelling those clerks who still remained at Ely. In short, he was, to use the language of Elfric the Grammarian, his biographer, 'terrible as a lion to the rebellious, but gentler than a lamb to the meek,' and he well earned the title of Father of the Monks.

There are yet two great names connected with that which was the distinctive feature of the tenth

[1] 'Ethelwolde, Abbate of Abingdon, and after Bishop of Winchestre, yn King Edgare's days, did clerely renovate and augmentid this abbey.'—Leland.

century—the revival of monachism—Oswald, Bishop of Worcester, and afterwards Archbishop of York; and Thurkitul, the famous Chancellor of Edgar. Oswald inclined rather to the moderate policy of Dunstan than to the harsh one of Ethelwold. At Worcester he adopted a plan which reminds one of the tactics of modern days. Instead of expelling the clerks from his cathedral, he built a new church, which was dedicated to S. Mary the Virgin, filled it with Benedictine monks, and, by making its services more attractive, and constantly attending them himself, succeeded in emptying the cathedral. At York he behaved as Dunstan did at Canterbury—not driving out the secular canons, but using his moral influence to recommend Benedictism. Thurkitul, the Chancellor, employed all the power he possessed, which was second only to that of Dunstan, to forward Dunstan's designs; and he showed the sincerity of his belief in monachism by ending his days in the abbey of Crowland, which he restored and beautified at his own expense, becoming the first Abbot of the new foundation.

The policy of Dunstan was continued by his successor at Canterbury, Archbishop Ethelgar, (Æthelgar), who had been trained under him at Glastonbury, and who had been Ethelwold's right-hand man at Abingdon. But he had not the master-mind of either of his friends; and if he *had* had, the weak and wilful character of King Ethelred would not have allowed him scope for its exercise.

The forty years which followed the death of Dunstan present but little interest to the Church historian, as they were occupied with incessant struggles with the Danes. Archbishop Siric,

Ethelgar's successor at Canterbury, who, like Ethelgar, had been trained at Glastonbury, was the first who gave the fatal counsel of bribing off the Danes.[1] It was like giving a wild beast the taste of blood, and dearly had England to pay for the disastrous weakness. In spite of the gallantry of Edmund Ironside, who staved off ruin for awhile, the condition of the country was deplorable until the Danes, under Canute (Cnut), gained the complete victory.

But in this period of darkness two names stand out brightly. One is that of Elfric, called Grammaticus. It is curious that, though few writings of the early English Church have been more frequently quoted than those of Elfric, it is still a vexed question who the writer himself was. Dr. Freeman (whose authority one cannot reject lightly) and Dean Hook identify him with the Archbishop of Canterbury of that name; Wharton, in his 'Anglia Sacra,' with the Archbishop of York.[2] Dr. Lingard, and apparently Bishop Stubbs, hold that he was a different person from either. The uncertainty is the more strange because Elfric tells us much about himself, though he does not settle his own identity. We gather that he was 'a monk and a Mass priest'; that Ethelmar (Ælmer), the Ealdorman of Devon-

[1] See the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle.

[2] It is now generally admitted that there were two archbishops named Elfric, the one Archbishop of Canterbury, and the other Archbishop of York; and Wharton's opinion that the latter was the homilist and grammarian seems to have strong evidence in its favour. But, on the whole, I am inclined to think that Elfric the Grammarian was a different person from either Archbishop, and that he never rose to a higher rank than that of Abbot, by which title he always describes himself.

shire, and promoter of monasticism in the West, and his son Ethelwerd (Æthelweard) were his patrons; that he was Abbot, first of Cerne, and then of Ensham, or Eynsham, both new monasteries founded by Ethelmar; but his later history is not clear, and we do not know the exact date of his birth or death. He certainly flourished at the close of the tenth and the beginning of the eleventh century, and was a voluminous writer on a variety of subjects, grammar, as his name implies, being one. Curiously enough, though he had a high opinion of Dunstan's work, declaring that 'there was no one who could write or understand Latin letters until Dunstan and Ethelwold revived learning,' yet it is the party which, of all others, would be most opposed to Dunstan that have most admired Elfric's writings. The reason is, that in his homilies, which are interesting specimens of Early English, he opposed the doctrine of Transubstantiation, and threw doubts upon the supremacy of S. Peter; and he has therefore been regarded as a sort of Protestant before Protestantism. His 'Paschal Homily,' denying the doctrine of Transubstantiation, was published by Archbishop Parker in 1566; and extracts from his writings on the Holy Sacrament were printed in the 1610 edition of Foxe's Martyrology.

The other name that emerges from the obscurity of this calamitous period is that of one who distinguished himself by his life and heroic death rather than by his writings. Ælfheah, or, as he is called in the calendar, S. Alphege (954-1012), was a Benedictine monk of pure and austere life, who in 984, by a last exertion of Dunstan's influence, was made Bishop of Winchester in succession to the famous Ethelwold.

In that capacity, he not only promoted Christianity with all his might at home, but also made an attempt to convert the heathen Northmen. He instructed in Christian doctrine Olaf, King of Norway, when the latter paid a visit to this country, and was the cause of a very effective mission being established in Sweden and Norway. In 1006 he was raised to the primacy; and the extreme popularity of the appointment of so saintly a man shows that the English in their depression had not lost the appreciation of goodness. But it was his glorious end which made the name of S. Alphege for ever memorable. King Ethelred had infuriated the Danes by a treacherous massacre, in which neither women nor children were spared, on S. Brice's Day, 1002. From that time the Danes harried the English incessantly, levying large sums as the price of the lives of those who could afford to pay. In 1011 they invested Canterbury, which held out for nineteen days, under the encouragement of the Archbishop. Alphege 'houselled' the soldiers in his cathedral before they went on the ramparts, and by 'a combination of piety, discretion, and valour,' was the very life of the besieged city. But on the twentieth day Canterbury was betrayed by an ecclesiastic,[1] and burnt. The Archbishop was among the captives, and was kept a prisoner for seven months on the Danish ships. He promised to pay a large ransom; but on considering whence the money must come, he repented, saying, 'What can be more unsuitable to the character of a Bishop than to make a present to the

[1] His name is said to have been Ælfmær, 'one of the superior clergy,' but nothing definite seems to be known about him.

pagans of things which are intended for the honour of religion and the benefit of the poor?' The heathens were all the more incensed against him on account of his earlier efforts to convert their countrymen, and because in his seven months' captivity he made some successful attempts to convert his gaolers. On the day when the money should have been paid, the Danes were feasting in their ships off Greenwich, and Alphege was introduced to make sport at their drunken revels. He persisted in refusing to pay the ransom, and the revellers pelted him with the skulls of the oxen on which they had been feasting. Thurkill, their leader, who afterwards became a sincere Christian, in vain interposed. At last a friendly foe put an end to his misery by cleaving his head with his axe. His bones were taken to London, and buried in S. Paul's; but eleven years later they were translated with great reverence by Canute to Canterbury.

The Church, as well as the State, found relief from her sufferings from a very unexpected quarter. At the beginning of 1017, Canute (Cnut), the younger son of Sweyn, conquered all England, completing the work which his father had all but achieved. He seems to have inherited that father's savage nature, for, though he was a baptized Christian, he showed no traces of a Christian spirit. He commenced his reign by putting to death some powerful English noblemen, including Eadric, his own friend, and a traitor to the English, and Ethelwerd, the patron of Elfric the Grammarian; and perpetrated other cruelties. There seemed every prospect of the bad times becoming worse; but suddenly a great change took place. Canute became in deed, what he had

been before only in name, a Christian.[1] Perhaps the instrument of his conversion was Ethelnoth, his favourite chaplain, whom he subsequently raised to the primacy. At any rate, Ethelnoth was his confidential friend and adviser, 'encouraging him in his good actions by the authority of his sanctity, and restraining him in his excesses.'[2] Canute was a wise and just ruler, who welded together Danes and English into one united people. The eighteen years of his reign (1017-1035) were a peaceful and prosperous period, recalling the halcyon days of Edgar, under a Danish instead of an English King. He was also, under the guidance of Ethelnoth, a true nursing father to the Church. In 1020 he built, in conjunction with Earl Thurkill, a church on the hill of Assandune, where he had gained his decisive victory over Edmund, and where 'the flower of the English race was destroyed';[3] he rebuilt the church of the East Anglian S. Edmund at Bury; he brought the remains of the martyred Archbishop Alphege to Canterbury—acts which were probably intended to show that the days of hostility between Danes and English were ended; he was a great benefactor to the Church generally, and to Canterbury, Winchester, Ely, and Ramsey in particular; he took a just and moderate line in the disputes between regulars and seculars, holding the balance evenly between them; he issued

[1] His change was deliberate, and frankly owned. 'I have vowed to God,' he wrote to his English subjects from Rome, 'to lead a right life in all things, to rule justly and piously my realms and subjects, and to administer just judgment to all. If heretofore I have done aught beyond what was just, through headiness or negligence of youth, I am ready, with God's help, to amend it utterly.'

[2] William of Malmesbury. [3] Anglo-Saxon Chronicle.

a code of laws in which a Christian spirit is no less conspicuous than a wise policy.[1] In short, it was a great misfortune to the Church and nation when, in 1035, he was cut off in the flower of his age (for he could not have been much more than forty when he died); and three years later his spiritual adviser, Ethelnoth, followed him to the grave.

The seven years during which the sons of Canute were striving for the mastery are a barren period in Church history; but the twenty-two which followed are rich in incident, and fraught with most important consequences to the National Church. It is a curious fact that the restoration of England's native line of kings was the chief cause of the denationalization of England's Church. We can well understand the importance that was attached to the election of Edward (Eadward), the true descendant of the ancient House of Cerdic, to the throne of his ancestors. On Easter Day, 1043, he was 'hallowed' King 'with great worship'[2] in the cathedral of the ancient

[1] Mr. Pearson will by no means admit the sincerity of Canute's conversion. Referring to his later, as well as his earlier, life, he writes: 'Canute had the cunning of a fox, the passions of a child, and the vindictive memory of a savage. His gifts to churches have embalmed his name in our chronicles' ('History of England,' i. 232). But after making due allowance for the natural partiality of Church historians for a benefactor of the Church, plain facts seem to me to show that Canute was a wise and just ruler. For the details of his wise and Christian laws, and the touching letter he wrote to his English subjects about 1026, which shows how thoroughly he had their best interests at heart, see Lingard, vol. i., ch. vi., pp. 159-161. Canute made England his chief residence, but he frequently visited Denmark, when he was in the habit of taking with him Christian missionaries to instruct his countrymen. All this argues the sincerity of his conversion.

[2] Anglo-Saxon Chronicle.

royal city of Winchester. The Archbishops of Canterbury and York and many of the bishops took part in the great event; the Archbishop of Canterbury 'well instructed and exhorted'[1] the new King; and after a quarter of a century of foreign domination England was to become herself again.

Never was anticipation more utterly falsified by the event. The great Dane had been far more in sympathy with England's ways than the native Englishman and descendant of a hundred English kings showed himself to be; and the National Church was managed far more in accordance with English traditions under Canute than it was under Edward. By name and birth Edward was an Englishman, but in education, character, and even in speech, he was essentially a foreigner; and as ecclesiastical affairs were the only affairs in which he took a really active interest, the Church suffered most of all from his foreign leanings. The one leading idea of his policy seemed to be to import as many foreigners as he could, and place them in the most influential posts. The country was divided into two parties: the national party, headed by Godwine, the powerful Earl of Wessex, and Leofric and Siward, the scarcely less powerful Earls of Mercia and Northumbria; and the foreign party, headed by the King, but soon virtually governed by a foreign ecclesiastic, Robert, Abbot of Jumièges, in Normandy, who in 1044 was appointed to the see of London. The influence of Robert with his Sovereign was so unbounded that it was said that 'if he declared a black crow to be white, the King would sooner believe his word than his own eyes.' The parties were not in the least

[1] Anglo-Saxon Chronicle.

welded together, but rather the reverse, by a marriage between Edward and Godwine's daughter Editha (Eadgytha). It has been said that England has suffered most under her best-intentioned monarchs, and the present is a case in point. It is not difficult to see how, from one point of view, Edward might be regarded, not altogether without reason, as a saint and confessor. He had many good qualities in which better kings had been lacking. He was sincerely devout, gracious and affable to his people, and really desirous of their good; he was pure in life, and quite free from that intemperance which, especially since the introduction of the Danish element, had become a national vice. But his virtues were those of the cloister, his defects those which were fatal to a really strong government. He was indolent, and governed by favourites, and, worst of all, foreign favourites. He brought the Church more and more under the power of Rome, whither he vowed to make a pilgrimage in person; but he was absolved from his vow by the Pope, on condition that he would give to the poor the money he would have spent on the journey, and build a monastery to the honour of S. Peter. Under the instigation of Bishop Robert, he established in all parts of the country alien priories—that is, cells under the control of some foreign monastery; a patent plan for denationalizing the Church.

The struggle between the foreign party, under the King, and the national party, under Earl Godwine, came to a head in 1050, when an Archbishop of Canterbury had to be appointed in the room of Eadsige. The Godwinites achieved a temporary triumph in the election of Elfric, a kinsman of Godwine, by the

chapter. The election was quite canonical, but it was without a *congé d'élire*. It was set aside, and Robert of Jumièges, the King's chief adviser, was seated in the chair of Augustine. The English did not tamely submit to be virtually governed by foreigners, and Godwine had the satisfaction of seeing before his death the removal of them, including Archbishop Robert himself, who was deposed from his archbishopric, Stigand, Bishop of Winchester, being installed in his room in 1052. Then we have a repetition of the story of Wilfrid three hundred years before. The deposed Archbishop appealed to Rome, won his appeal, but utterly failed to make the English Church and nation bow to the will of the Pope and his curia.

It is unfortunate that in both these memorable cases, Wilfrid's and Robert's, the right was not clearly on the side of England. It must be owned that Robert was the lawful Archbishop of Canterbury, and, as a matter of fact, though England would not hear of being dictated to by Rome, she hardly regarded Stigand as the real Primate. His history, however, forms an interesting link between the early English and the Anglo-Norman Church. He first comes under our notice as parish priest of Canute's church on Assandune Hill; then as chaplain and confessor of Queen Emma; then as 'Bishop of the East Angles,' being consecrated to the see of Elmham, with which Dunwich was now united, in 1043. But in the same year he was involved in the disasters which befell Queen Emma when her son Edmund became King. 'Stigand,' says the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, 'was deposed from his bishopric, and all that he possessed was seized into the King's

hands, because he was nearest to his mother's councils, and she went just as he advised her, as people thought.' But when Godwine's party was uppermost, Stigand was appointed to the see of Winchester in 1047, and, on the deposition of Robert, was raised to the primacy, still retaining Winchester. Though he was regarded as *de facto* rather than *de jure* Archbishop, his friendship with Godwine, and afterwards with Godwine's son Harold, secured his acceptance after a fashion.

There is a melancholy interest about the last years of Edward's life, as closing a most important chapter in English Church history. The real power was in the hands of Harold, and, as a consequence, there was little activity, intellectual or practical, in the National Church.[1] For monachism was then the chief engine of Church energy, and Harold, like his father, was a sworn foe of monachism; his splendid foundation at Waltham was a college rather than an abbey; it was filled with secular priests, and was intended to be an educational establishment attached to the church which he built there.[2] The King's

[1] William of Malmesbury, contrasting this period with earlier and palmier days, writes: 'What shall I say of the great army of bishops, hermits, and abbots? Does not the whole island so shine with these relics of the old inhabitants that you can scarcely pass a single village of any size without hearing the name of a new saint? And how many more are lost to memory for want of chroniclers? But as time went on, the study of letters and of religion decayed, shortly before the coming of the Normans. The clergy, content with a smattering of literary knowledge, could scarcely stammer the words of the sacraments; one who knew grammar was a prodigy and marvel to the rest.'

[2] 'Harold did not found an abbey; Waltham did not become a religious house till Henry the Second, liberal of another man's

energies were all directed to the fulfilment of his promise to the Pope. As early as 1051 he began the rebuilding of the great monastery on Thorney Island, beyond the West Gate of London, which was completed in 1061.[1] Then followed the building of the church, which was consecrated on Holy Innocents' Day, 1065. But while the consecration was going on, Edward lay a-dying, and within a fortnight the last King of the old royal line was in his grave. With his death ends the history of the early English Church, and it only remains to sum up some of its chief characteristics.

There is a peculiar interest in the Church before the Conquest from the point of view of this work; for it was *par excellence* a National Church. During the five[2] centuries that have rapidly passed before us, it not only represented the best features of the national life, but it was the most important of all factors in welding together all classes, and giving a model for what had not yet become one united nation.[3] There seems to have been absolutely no

purse, destroyed Harold's foundation by way of doing honour to the new martyr of Canterbury. Harold founded a Dean and Secular Canons.'—Freeman's 'History of the Norman Conquest,' ii. 440.

[1] There may have been 'some small and obscure monastery' here before; but the real annals of S. Peter's monastery may be said to begin with Abbot Edwyn and Edward the Confessor. See 'Annals of Westminster Abbey,' by E. T. Bradley, pp. 4, 5.

[2] Perhaps it would be more accurate to say four; for the Church can scarcely be said to have been established before the time of Theodore—that is, in 664. But the same principle was at work on a smaller scale, and at various centres, from the very beginning; so I leave the 'five' in the text unaltered.

[3] See the admirable remarks of Bishop Stubbs on this point

friction in the relations between Church and State. There were, of course, individual ecclesiastics who came into collision with the State authorities, and individual laymen who came into collision with the ecclesiastical authorities; but these were isolated cases, and in scarcely any instance brought the two bodies to which they belonged into conflict. The functions of each were clearly defined, and they rarely clashed. 'The Bishop and the Ealdorman sat side by side at the shire-mote to expound God's law and the world's law';[1] the clergy were, like other citizens, punishable by the State for offences which came under the cognizance of the State, and the laity devolved upon the clergy the duty of carrying out those laws which seemed especially to belong to their province. Thus, the trial by ordeal, which in those simple times was regarded as affording a conclusive proof of guilt or innocence, was directed by the clergy because it was thought to be an appeal from man to God;[2] cases of perjury, again, came within the province of the clergy because they involved an offence against religion as well as society. The limits of each diocese corresponded originally (with one,

('Const. Hist.,' i. 266, etc.)—and more in detail, Kemble's 'Saxons in England' and Freeman's 'Norman Conquest.'

[1] Bright's 'Chapters of Early English Church History,' p. 355.

[2] Dr. Lingard tells us ('History of England,' ii. 245) that 'though the trial by ordeal was consecrated with religious ceremonies, the popes had always condemned it as an unwarranted appeal to the judgment of the Almighty.' If so, this is one of many instances of the fact that the English Church regarded itself as an independent Church so far as jurisdiction was concerned; for trial by ordeal was certainly practised in spite of the disapproval of popes. The popes were right, and the English Church was wrong; but this does not affect the question of fact.

and that only an apparent, exception)[1] to the limits of each little kingdom, and the bishops were from the first looked upon as State officers as well as Church officers. They did not consider it at all inconsistent with their sacred office to act as such. Nor was it; for the religious element in the Constitution was so strong that many of the decrees of the different Witans read more like sermons than Acts of Parliament. The famous 'Dooms of Ina' are much more like the canons of an ecclesiastical synod than the statutes of a temporal King.

This remarkable harmony between Church and State was, no doubt, due in part to the fact that the conversion of almost every little kingdom in England began with the King and his Court, and spread downwards; it was, we might almost say, 'the fashion' for kings and nobles to identify themselves with Christianity. Instances of kings resigning their thrones and retiring into monasteries are numerous. Ethelred, King of the Mercians, ended his days as Abbot of Bardney, in 705; Ceolwulf, King of Northumbria, resigned his kingdom in 737, and became a monk of Lindisfarne, where he died in 764; Sigebert, King of East Anglia, retired to a monastery, which he was forced to leave only to die in battle; Ina, King of Wessex, died in the cloister. Queens, princesses, and ladies of royal birth frequently founded monasteries, and either presided over them or lived in them as simple sisters. Eanfled, the daughter of one King and wife of another, was Abbess of Whitby; so was her daughter Elfleda (Ælflæd); and before them

[1] The exception, of course, is Rochester, which stood (and still stands) in a peculiar relation to the see of Canterbury.

S. Hilda, the foundress of Whitby, and previously the Abbess of Hartlepool, was the grand-niece of a King; S. Ebba, a daughter of one King and sister of two, was Abbess of Coldingham; and Etheldreda, the daughter of the good King Anna, was Abbess of Ely.

On the other hand, while the Church was thus closely connected with the highest classes, it was regarded as the best friend of the poor, and hence formed a most valuable link between the different grades of society. It was also a ladder by which members of the lowest class might rise to the highest. S. Cuthbert, the greatest saint of the North, on whom a powerful monarch had humbly to wait to implore him to accept a bishopric, had been a mere shepherd lad. Cædmon, one of the glories of the early Church, though he never rose nor cared to rise to any dignity, had been nothing better than a cowherd.

The implicit confidence that was then placed in the Church was enhanced by the fact that all education was exclusively in her hands; and this was a part of her work which she did not neglect. We think of Archbishop Theodore, the real founder of the Church of England as a National Church, establishing, with the able assistance of Hadrian, schools to which vast numbers of scholars flocked, to be taught secular as well as sacred learning; of Bede imparting his multifarious knowledge to his six hundred scholars, and writing educational works for their benefit; of Felix insisting upon education as an essential part of his missionary work in East Anglia; of Benedict Biscop storing up a noble collection of books for the benefit of others, not of himself; of Egbert and

Albert and Alcuin in the cloister school at York; of Dunstan, as Abbot of Glastonbury, establishing his famous school there, and himself teaching in it; and we feel how very prominent a place education must have taken in the early English Church. Mr. F. D. Maurice, writing of the results of the introduction of Christianity into England, says, with truth: 'Schools seem to rise as by enchantment; all classes, down to the poorest (Bede himself is the obvious example), are admitted to them; the studies, beginning from theology, embrace logic, rhetoric, music, and astronomy.'[1] And just as the individual scholar never ceases to regard with respect, and even awe, the trusted teacher to whom he is indebted for all he knows, so it was in the relations between the Church as a body and the State as a body.

The Church, on her part, was thoroughly patriotic; she was almost as deeply interested in the welfare of the different kingdoms which she had so large a share in welding into the one great realm of England, as in her spiritual functions. In short, as Dr. Freeman tersely and pointedly expresses it, 'the nation was intensely religious, and the Church was intensely national.'

The weak side of this remarkable union, which continued, with few breaks, for more than four centuries, and to which it would be hard to find a parallel, was that it partly arose *from*, and partly contributed *to form*, an insularity which, from the nature of things, could not last. It was by no mere figure of speech that the Primate of all England was termed 'Papa alterius orbis'; but when that 'alter orbis' became less isolated from the great world

[1] 'Philosophy of the First Six Centuries,' p. 153.

beyond the seas, then there arose necessarily a change in the relations between Church and State. That change would probably have come under any circumstances; but it was hastened and aggravated by the great wave of conquest which swept over the land, and entirely changed, at least for a time, the whole face of affairs.

Another weakness, which, though not perhaps peculiar to the early English Church, is certainly very noticeable in it, was the survival of heathen ideas long after heathenism had given place to a better faith. 'The decrees of Anglo-Saxon councils,' writes Canon Bright,[1] 'abound in prohibitions of charms, incantations, auguries, omens, necromancy, or heathenish rites connected with wells, with stones, or with trees.' Such superstitions are perhaps inevitable in a rude and simple state of society. Indeed, before 'the schoolmaster was abroad' they lingered on in rural England up to a very late date. But they are less observable in the Anglo-Norman than in the early English Church; and so in this, as in some other matters, we trace an improvement in the new order of things which will come before us in the next chapter.

But in spite of these drawbacks, there is a charm about the Church before the Conquest which we certainly miss in the subsequent period. This charm is perhaps partly due to the method of England's conversion. Again to quote Canon Bright: 'The conversion of our Anglo-Saxon fathers was effected more completely and more healthfully than that of any other "barbarian" race.'[2] 'In no part of the

[1] 'The Roman See in the Early Church, and Other Studies in Church History,' p. 348.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 351.

world,' says Freeman, 'did Christianity make its way in a more honourable manner.'[1] In no part of the world, we may add, was there a national conversion so genuine, so pure, on the whole, in its dominant motives, or so rich in examples of Christian nobleness, in lives and deaths full of truest moral beauty. It is to that first age of the old English Church that a great writer refers when he says that 'in its best days it had a straightforward seriousness of purpose, and a fire, a thoroughness of faith, among its early converts, which are very much its own.'[2]

Is it fanciful to think that another reason of the attractiveness of the early English Church is that it is the Church in its childhood? All right-minded men, it is said, love children, and the Church of this period has all the freshness, the simplicity, the guilelessness—perhaps also the waywardness—of the child. Homer's heroes are far more attractive than Virgil's, partly because they belonged to the *juventus mundi*. And so with the heroes of the Church. In a more advanced and artificial state of society such a character as Bede, such a lawgiver as Alfred prefacing his code with the Ten Commandments, such a poet as Cædmon, would have been anachronisms; but they all fit in naturally with their primitive surroundings. We are passing, by an almost abrupt transition, to a totally different condition of the Church, in which her best representatives had a far wider range of thought and experience, but were not so loveable; in short, we are passing from the sweet simplicity of childhood to the hardness and too great knowingness of manhood.

[1] 'Norman Conquest,' i. 29

[2] Dean Church, 'The Beginning of the Middle Ages,' p. 68 of first edition.

CHAPTER VI.

THE MEDIÆVAL CHURCH.

From the Norman Conquest to the Death of Henry I. (1066-1135).

William: in what sense 'the Conqueror'—Posed as an Englishman, and as leader of a holy war—Introduced Continental ideas of religion—Papal legates invited—Stigand deposed—Lanfranc—His antecedents—His contest with Thomas of York—Separation of civil and ecclesiastical courts—Transference of bishops' sees to large centres—Revival of monasticism—Abbeys exempted from episcopal jurisdiction—Celibacy of clergy—William refused to do fealty to the Pope—Made bishops vassals of the Crown—Lanfranc posed as an Englishman—His services to the Church—Vast amount of church-building—Native bishops and abbots deposed—Wulfstan, Bishop of Worcester—Legend of his staff—Puts down slave trade—His reputation—Deaths of William and Lanfranc—The Red King—Anselm made Primate—His early history—His disputes with William—His journey to Rome—His work at the Council of Bari—Impatience for his return—His refusal to do homage for temporalities of see to Henry I.—His return to Rome—Settlement of dispute by a compromise—His activity in episcopal work—His writings—His high repute—Two new bishoprics created—Extension of monastic system — The Cluniacs — Cistercians — Carthusians — Augustin Canons — Gilbertines — Præmonstratensians — Knights of S. John and Knights Templars—Ralph, Archbishop of Canterbury, and Thurstan, Archbishop of York—Dispute between them settled by the Pope—Advance of Rome—Eadmer and 'the bishopric of Scotland'—Papal Legate supersedes Primate—'*Legatus natus.*'

To understand the effects which the Norman Conquest produced upon the Church in England, two

facts must be carefully borne in mind: (1) that, though it was essentially a foreign conquest, the foreign conqueror was most careful not to pose in that capacity; (2) that a halo of religion was cast over the whole work. These points must be elucidated in detail.

1. Though William is rightly termed 'the Conqueror,' it is strictly in the literal, not in the conventional, sense of the term; that is, he came over to England to 'gain possession' (*conquirere*) of what he claimed as his right, not to conquer 'vi et armis' which did not belong to him. As a matter of fact, no conquest was ever made more completely by the power of the sword, no conqueror ever ruled more by force than by love, more because the conquered could not help themselves than because they willingly accepted his rule, than William; but this was not the principle upon which he professed to act. He came as the lawful heir of the last Sovereign, as the proper successor of the sainted Edward, as the choice of the people; and at his coronation in Westminster Abbey, Aldred, Archbishop of York, asked the people whether they would have William for their King, and they replied with acclamations of assent. He implied that *Harold* had been a usurper, but he himself was not. Of course, neither Harold nor William had, strictly speaking, the true claim; that belonged to the young Ætheling, Edgar, the grandson of Edward Ironside; but the line of succession had never been rigorously adhered to in the English kingdoms, and probably under no circumstances would Edgar have been accepted as King by the whole of the English nation. Putting Edgar aside, William could make out a strong claim for himself. Edward had designated him as his successor; he

was his near, though not his nearest, relative; he had the sanction of the highest ecclesiastical authority on his side. Independent England might chafe against the interference of a Roman foreigner in their domestic affairs, but, still, it could not but attach weight to the approval of the successor of S. Peter.

Though a foreigner to the backbone, William desired to rule as an English King; he spoke of 'my predecessor' as if he were himself a descendant of the house of Cerdic. He paid at first great court to the irregularly appointed Archbishop Stigand, and to Aldred, the thoroughly English Archbishop of York, as the representatives of the English Church; he made, at the ripe age of forty-three, an ineffectual attempt to learn the English language. In short, if his new subjects would only have let him, he would have ruled them as the King of their choice; but when they would not accept him in that character, then his native sternness and iron inflexibility of will showed themselves. If these stubborn islanders would not have him as their chosen King, they should know that he was their master, to whom they would be obliged to pay implicit obedience. He was the exact antithesis of his predecessor. Edward was an Englishman born, who turned himself into a foreigner; William was a foreigner born, who strove, with indifferent success, to turn himself into an Englishman.

2. William regarded his invasion of England as essentially a religious work. His mission was to reform the barbarous islanders; and before that could be done he had to wage a holy war. Indications of this view of the matter meet us at every turn. Harold was to be warred upon, not only as a usurper, but

as a sacrilegious perjurer who had taken a solemn oath of fealty to William with his hand upon the altar above the holy relics, and then had violated it; so William appeared in the ranks at Senlac with the relics on which Harold had sworn hung round his neck, and before the great battle he made a vow to God, in the hearing of his barons, that, if he won, he would found a church for the common benefit of his followers. The benighted English had to be taught that they must not break all Church rules, accept as their Primate one who had been uncanonically appointed when the primacy was not really vacant, and, in defiance of Papal injunction, refuse to receive back again the properly appointed and improperly deposed Archbishop. The Pope, instigated by Hildebrand, blessed the holy enterprise, issued a Bull excommunicating Harold, and sent a consecrated banner of S. Peter, which William carried on board his own ship to remind all men that God was on the Norman side. William, having conquered the foes of God and man, should then receive the kingdom as a fief of the Holy See. William kept his own counsel about this last point, but he was willing enough to accept the blessing of the Church. It would strengthen his position enormously, awakening in his favour that religious enthusiasm which broke forth a few years later in the shape of the Crusades. In fact, his *was* a Crusade, and it was quite in character with the relative positions of the two parties that the Normans should spend the night before the battle in prayer and fasting, while the English spent it in carousing. Men's motives are so complicated that it is impossible to say how much of all this was piety, and how much policy; but that

William was a conscious hypocrite I do not for one moment believe.

These points have been dwelt upon at some length because they had a most important bearing upon Church affairs. Except by sheer force, William could never be King of England so long as England was the England of Alfred and Edgar; and what above all other things had made England what she had been was her National Church. William's view of religion was the continental, not the insular view; and the Church as well as the State must bow to his will. Thus, all the changes which took place tended to one end—to make the National Church less insular and more continental; in other words, less English and more Roman; in short, to bring it distinctly 'into the organized ecclesiastical system of the Western patriarchate, recognising the general visitatorial authority of the Roman See.'[1] And Rome then meant the Rome of Hildebrand; for though Hildebrand did not become Pope, as Gregory VII., until some years later (1073), his was already the master-mind at Rome, and his great object was to assert the supremacy of the Pope above the Church, and of the Church above the State.

In 1070 both the archiepiscopal sees were vacant, Canterbury through the deposition of Stigand, York through the death of Aldred, the English Archbishop who had placed the crown on William's head. The deposition of Stigand took place at a council at Winchester, which legates from Rome were permitted to summon. This was quite a new departure, and ominously significant. For the first time Papal legates were not only *received* in England, but actu-

[1] Cutts' 'History of the Church of England,' p. 74.

ally *sent for* to regulate the affairs of the National Church. Ermenfried, Bishop of Sion in Switzerland, was one of the legates sent by Pope Alexander II., and his first act was to depose Stigand, against whom the Pope had a special grievance as the supporter of the Anti-Pope, Benedict X., from whom he had received the pall. This also gave a pretext for the deprivation of other native prelates. The legates came with orders from Pope Alexander that all who had been ordained by Stigand should be deposed or suspended. The purport of their commission was the reformation of the English clergy; the method of reformation was, to a great extent, 'to reform them off the face of the earth,' or, at any rate, of the Church.

Lanfranc, Stigand's successor, towers far above all the ecclesiastics in England of his day, and was partly the instrument, partly the guide, of the Conqueror's policy in Church affairs. His antecedents would scarcely have led us to expect that he would play the part with more than competency; for he seemed rather adapted to be the recluse student (as, indeed, he was) than the ecclesiastical statesman. Like all the newly-appointed prelates, he was a foreigner. Born at Pavia in Lombardy about 1005, he became a student of the law in his native city; and he also acquired a taste for literature and science generally. His exact age is not known, but he must have been more than thirty years old when he migrated from his native Italy to Normandy. About the year 1039 he opened a school at Avranches, to which he soon attracted crowds of scholars. Hitherto he appears to have taken no particular interest in theology; but now came a change. His one desire

was to become a monk, and in due time he became Prior of Bec, which under him rose to a very high eminence among the schools of Normandy. Then he was appointed by Duke William—who had, if the expression may be allowed, an eye for great Churchmen—Abbot of his new foundation of S. Stephen's at Caen. In the year 1067, the archbishopric of Rouen, the highest ecclesiastical post in Normandy, was offered to him, but he refused it. He was equally anxious to decline the still higher post of Canterbury, when it was offered to him by his patron—now become King of England—in 1070. His reluctance arose from the very natural unwillingness of a student and a foreigner to undertake an office for which neither his birth, nor his inclination, nor his experience appeared to have fitted him; but his scruples were overcome at last by the importunity of Pope Alexander II., who had been his scholar at Bec, and who would also know him favourably as the able champion of the doctrine of Transubstantiation against Berengar of Tours. Both the Pope and the King knew their man better than he knew himself. For the particular work that they required of him he was better adapted than any other man they could possibly have found. But he was not a mere tool in the hands of either King or Pope. On more than one occasion we find him taking an independent line of his own, differing, now from the one, and now from the other.

The moulding of the Church of England under its new conditions seems to me to have been more the work of Lanfranc than of any other man. Like Theodore, he was past the prime of life when he became Primate, and, like Theodore, he displayed all

the vigour of youth, tempered by the experience of age. One of the first acts of his primacy showed how strong an Archbishop the quondam recluse was likely to make. He declined to consecrate Thomas, Archbishop of York, royal chaplain and favourite though he was, unless he would own the supremacy of Canterbury. In vain was it urged that Gregory the Great had originally designed two independent metropolitan sees; *that*, argued Lanfranc, applied to London and York, and it was not to the purpose at the present day. He used an argument to the King which was of real, practical force. An independent Archbishop of York might crown an independent King of Northumbria. This was no imaginary danger; for the most formidable opposition to the Conqueror had come from Northumbria, where there had lately been a rising in favour of the true heir, Edgar the Ætheling, which might have been fatal to the success of a less strong man than William. No! for the interest of the State, as well as of the Church, there must be only one supreme authority in the ecclesiastical as in the civil domain. The question was not settled until 1072, when a council held at Windsor decided in favour of Lanfranc. It is true that a sort of compromise was arrived at, by which York was made theoretically independent of Canterbury, but practically Lanfranc carried his point. So far as *he* was concerned, he was left free to carry out his projects for the whole Church of England without fear of obstruction from the rival Metropolitan of the North.

Those projects were, to bring the National Church into closer conformity with Continental Christendom —in other words, with Rome; to revive or reform

monasticism; and to encourage and advance learning.

One of the most effective methods for furthering the first project was by making a more sharply-marked division between the civil and ecclesiastical jurisdictions than had ever existed in early English times. The old English Witenagemots gave place to the feudal councils, in which, indeed, the bishops still sat, but as barons, not as prelates. The frequent synods which were held under Lanfranc assumed more and more a purely ecclesiastical character; and the ecclesiastical courts were formally separated from the civil, the King declaring the union of civil and ecclesiastical jurisdiction to be mischievous.[1] Such a separation would tend to weaken the nationality of the Church, which would naturally be brought into closer connection with Rome, though England still declined to accept Rome as the final court of appeal.[2] Less obviously, but not less really, was the same object promoted by the transference of bishops' sees from country places to large centres; for one distinction between English and Continental life was that the former was essentially a country life, while the latter always tended to centralize itself in the great cities. The process began long before the time of Lanfranc,—one may even say, from the time of Wilfrid. It went on rapidly in the days of the Confessor, but more

[1] Bishop Stubbs ('Const. Hist.,' i. 307) writes: 'The most important ecclesiastical measure of the reign, ordering the separation of the Church jurisdiction from the secular business of the Courts of Law, is unfortunately, like all other charters of the time, undated.'

[2] See 'The Civil Power in its Relations to the Church,' by J. W. Joyce, p. 12, etc.

rapidly still after the Norman Conquest. In a national synod held at S. Paul's in 1075, at which both the archbishops, with their suffragans, were present, it was formally decreed that bishoprics should be removed from villages to large centres. The Devonshire see had already been removed from Crediton to Exeter (A.D. 1050); the Sussex see was removed from Selsey to Chichester; the Somersetshire see from Wells to Bath; and the huge diocese of which the insignificant village of Dorchester was the Bishop's seat was centred at Lincoln. The sees of Sherborne and Ramsbury were united, and removed to the hill-fortress which overlooks Salisbury; the Mercian see, which had long had its centre in the historical but small city of Lichfield, was removed to Chester, and thence transferred to Coventry. The East Anglian see was removed, first to Thetford, and then to the far more important Norwich. All this was an assimilation of the English to the Continental system, and made the National Church more and more unlike what she had been under her native prelates.

Another step in the same direction was the reform of monasticism, of which Lanfranc was the life and soul. A monk himself, he was thoroughly in his element when engaged in this part of his work. The monasteries were the most distinctive features of the early English Church; they at once directed and reflected the character of that Church from time to time; and Lanfranc knew perfectly well that when he touched *them* he touched the life of the Church at its heart. Hence 'his hand was heavy upon the native abbots'; they were either displaced at the first opportunity, or were forced into a conformity with

the stricter rule on which he insisted ; and when they were removed by death their places were at once filled by foreigners. At the same time, the monastic order was largely increased ; regular monks took the place of secular canons in all the cathedrals where the plan was feasible. Lanfranc built a large Benedictine abbey in connection with his own cathedral ; and when Bishop Walkelin took what appeared to him the retrograde step of substituting seculars for regulars at Winchester, Lanfranc promptly appealed to the Pope, and, unlike former appellants, carried his point, not only at Rome, but in England. The edifice was crowned when at last the great abbey which William vowed to erect on the hill-top when Harold was slain was completed. Battle Abbey was exempted from the ordinary jurisdiction of its diocesan, the Bishop of Chichester. The precedent was soon followed elsewhere ; and monks freed from the control of the authorities of the National Church owned no master outside their own precincts, except Rome, and thus became in effect the Dissenters of the age.

At the same time, Lanfranc took the utmost pains to improve the internal condition of the monasteries themselves. They were no longer suffered to remain seats of idleness and inefficiency ; they were bound strictly to the Benedictine rule ; he would have them all be what he himself had made Bec.

There was yet one more question which had been a bone of contention for many generations, but which had never been so effectually dealt with as it was by William and Lanfranc. In the year 1076 a council at Winchester, convened by Lanfranc, emphatically

condemned the marriage of the clergy. It was impossible to make at once a clean sweep; that would have created nothing less than a revolution; and Lanfranc, though a bold and determined, was at the same time a prudent and considerate man; but all was done that could be done to enforce clerical celibacy. The cathedral clergy were absolutely forbidden to marry. 'Let no canon have a wife' was the curt rule. But the parochial clergy were grudgingly permitted to retain their wives, though a distinct slur was cast upon their ministrations; and henceforth no married clergy were to be ordained, and no ordained clergy were to marry. This was again a step in the direction of denationalizing the Church; the clergy were separated from the domestic life of the nation, and became more and more a separate caste.

The tendency of all these measures was not apparent at once; for the strong hands of William and Lanfranc put down all attempts to encroach upon the independence of England as a nation, and of the English Church as a National Church. 'At no time,' writes Dr. Freeman, 'was the royal supremacy in matters ecclesiastical more fully carried out than in the time of William.'[1] When the Roman Legate demanded the payment of Peter's Pence, William consented to pay because his predecessors had done so; but the further demand that he should do fealty for his throne he promptly resisted, because 'he had never heard that his predecessors had done that'; and he wrote to the Pope to that effect.[2] He was deter-

[1] 'Norman Conquest,' vol. i., 437.

[2] 'Fidelitatem facere nolui nec volo, quia nec ego promisi, nec antecessores meos antecessoribus tuis id fecisse comperio.' See 'Lanfranci Opera,' vol. i., p. 32.

mined to be absolute master in his own dominions, and to allow none of his subjects to submit to a divided authority. With the concurrence of Lanfranc, he constituted bishops vassals of the Crown, telling the Archbishop that he intended to have all the croziers of England in his own hands. The clergy were not to acknowledge any as Pope until the royal consent had been obtained; no letters from Rome were to be published until they had first been approved by the King, and no ecclesiastic was to leave the country at his own pleasure.[1] 'The English Church assembled in council' was to pass 'no laws or canons except such as he had recommended or approved.' In return he made a partial restitution of the property which had been plundered by Harold from the Church; and the estates of the Church were largely increased by Norman piety. Lanfranc was thoroughly loyal to his royal master and his adopted country; and even so strong a Pope as Gregory VII. could not move him either by remonstrances or threats. Indeed, in his relation to his new home, Lanfranc seems, of his own accord, to have taken the same line as the King. He posed as an Englishman, spoke of 'us English' and 'our island'; but his England was to be a new England, an England of his own and William's making. He appears to have felt something like contempt for the learning, and even for the saintliness, of those whom he called 'his predecessors'; he even denied the title of martyr to S. Alphege, on the ground that his death was not in defence of the faith; but his own successor, Anselm, convinced him (he was always

[1] See Hook's 'Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury,' vol. ii., ch. ii., p. 145.

open to conviction) that by that mode of reasoning S. John the Baptist himself could not be counted as a martyr.

But while, as patriots, we may resent his depreciation of our English saints and scholars, and regret the various steps which ultimately tended to make our English Church less national, we must not fail to do justice to the real services Lanfranc rendered to the Church. It unquestionably became more learned, more efficient, more *en rapport* with the general life of Christendom, and far more magnificent under his *régime* than it had been. It had indeed sunk to a low estate in the generation before the Conquest. With one or two brilliant exceptions, it was singularly lacking in distinguished men; abuses had become rife; pluralities had increased, as was natural when its two highest officers were glaring pluralists—the one actually holding the great bishopric of Winchester along with Canterbury, the other the see of Worcester along with York.

To this very day the outward and visible signs of the vigour of the Anglo-Norman Church are conspicuous. Never has there been a period when the efforts of church-builders have attained such magnificent results. Lanfranc himself rebuilt Canterbury Cathedral on a scale of unparalleled grandeur, and his brother Metropolitan, Thomas of York, repaired to such an extent that he may almost be said to have rebuilt York Minster, when it was 'a blackened ruin.' Wulfstan rebuilt Worcester; Gundulf, Rochester; Walkelin, Winchester; and Remigius rendered the incumbency of the first Bishop of Lincoln memorable by the erection of the cathedral (many parts of which are still standing) on 'the sovereign hill.' The huge

pile of S. Albans was completed; and that of S. Paul's, London, begun with great magnificence by Bishop Maurice. The numerous parish churches which still bear traces of Norman architecture are standing monuments of the vigour which the Church of this period showed in all parts of the country; and if, perchance, there may have been some cause for the complaint of Wulfstan, that the rearing of the spiritual edifice did not keep pace with that of the edifices of stone, we may at least say, 'These ought ye to have done, and not to have left the other undone.' We must also make some allowance for the different spirit of the old Englishman, who had not been trained, perhaps, to estimate at their real value these endeavours to honour God by the dedication to Him of the best of man's substance.

The commanding stature of the two chief actors in the drama both of Church and State dwarfs all the other figures on the stage. Nevertheless, the Church was better manned during this period than it had ever been, and that mainly through the instrumentality of William and Lanfranc themselves. It is true that it was part of their policy to get rid, as far as possible, of the native prelates and abbots; but it is equally true that the few who were retained were the flowers of the flock. Chief among these was Wulfstan, Bishop of Worcester, who survived all the rest, and remained for many years the last of the English bishops. Wulfstan revived a type of piety which had not been seen in England since the days of S. Aidan, S. Chad, and S. Cuthbert, and which was rarely seen afterwards. Of course there were numbers of good men, but there was lacking in them that sweet simplicity of goodness which is so

attractive in the Celtic saints. If there be any truth in the legend, neither William nor Lanfranc can claim the credit of retaining the saintliest of native prelates at his post. It is said that, at a council at Westminster, (date not clearly defined), Wulfstan was required to deliver up his pastoral staff because his ignorance of the French tongue prevented him from being 'of any use in the King's business'; Wulfstan, declaring that he would only deliver up his staff to him who gave it, laid it on the Confessor's tomb hard by, when the solid marble cleft and took in the staff. King and prelate in vain strove to pluck it out, but when Wulfstan put forth his hand it yielded at once. But the legend, even *as* a legend, cannot be traced to any contemporary or trustworthy source. There is better foundation for other stories about Wulfstan. There is no reason to doubt that, by his courageous and persistent preaching at Bristol, he succeeded, where William with all his power had failed, in entirely putting down the iniquitous traffic in slaves which had long been going on between that port and Ireland; nor that he recovered for his see the twelve manors of which Aldred, when no longer allowed to hold Worcester in plurality with York, had robbed it; nor that he devoted all his energies to the raising the spiritual edifice of Christ's Church, as well as the material edifice of Worcester Cathedral; nor that he made 'a sort of spiritual confederation' between his own cathedral monastery and six other great abbeys (Evesham, Chertsey, Bath, Pershore, Winchcomb, and Gloucester), whereby they bound themselves 'to be obedient to God, S. Mary, S. Benedict, and to their own Bishop, as well as to be loyal to their world-lord King William, and to

Matilda the Lady,' and 'to be seven monasteries as though they were but one monastery, their inmates to have one heart and one soul,' and 'to perform certain special acts of devotion and charity.' Wulfstan's reputation for saintliness long survived him. More than a hundred years after his death, the worst of all our kings bequeathed his soul to the care of God and S. Wulfstan, and his body to be buried in the cathedral where the saint's dust lay, as if Wulfstan's goodness could in some measure atone for John's badness.

Another native prelate who was suffered to retain his see 'on account of his goodness,' and who presided over it with universal applause, was William, Bishop of London, to whose tomb in the nave of S. Paul's the citizens of London used for many years to make annual pilgrimages, in gratitude to one to whose intercession they owed the restoration and confirmation of all their ancient privileges by the Conqueror.[1] Nor must we omit to notice, among foreigners, Gundulf, Bishop of Rochester, whose architectural genius was of great service in that age of building, but who achieved a better reputation as a holy and active prelate; nor Thomas of Bayeux, Archbishop of York, who made a mark upon his metropolitan see which has not yet been obliterated; nor Ingulf, the famous Abbot and historian of Crowland, who, though a native Englishman, had settled in Normandy as Prior of Fontenels, but was expressly recalled by William himself to preside over the great Fen monastery. Space would fail to tell of others. Suffice it to say that under William and Lanfranc the Church promised to be

[1] See Dean Milman's 'Annals of S. Paul's Cathedral,' ch. i., p. 17.

what it had been in its best days, with the inestimable advantage of wider sympathies, wider culture, and deeper learning.

But, alas! this was not to be. When the great King and the great Archbishop were both removed from the scene, a change for the worse took place. William was succeeded by a most degenerate son, who took for his counsellor a bad adviser, Ranulf Flambard, an able but unprincipled clerk whom he made his justiciar. Whether Lanfranc could have controlled William II. it is impossible to say; during the two years of the reign which he lived to see, he certainly exercised some restraining influence over the tyrant; but it is difficult to see how any right-minded clergyman could have worked in harmony with the Red King. William had all the hardness and dogged determination of his father without a spark of that real appreciation of goodness which, when not crossed by a stronger counter-influence, made the first William in his best moments a true nursing-father to the Church. On the death of Lanfranc in 1089, the King kept the see of Canterbury vacant for nearly four years, and then, in a temporary fit of remorse, nominated the man who had the highest reputation for piety and learning of any man in Europe, the man who of all others was most desired by all good men. This was the famous Anselm, who might well shrink from the dangerous union with the Red King. 'It was,' he said, 'to yoke an untamed bull and an old feeble sheep to the plough of the Church, which ought to be drawn by two strong oxen'—like Lanfranc and William I. But to appreciate his position we must go back to his early history.

On the Italian side of the Alps, at the very foot of the great St. Bernard, and surrounded on all sides by magnificent snow-capped mountains, lies the beautiful city of Aosta, the Augusta Prætoria of the Rome of the Empire. At or near Aosta Anselm was born, of a noble family, in 1033. Like many other saints, he owed his spiritual training to his mother, though its good effects did not appear at once. But a beautiful legend tells how in his boyhood he imagined that heaven rested upon the mountains, and how he dreamed that he climbed the mountain-side until he reached the palace of the Great King, where he sat at the Lord's feet and told Him how he grieved that His handmaids were idling in the harvest-fields in the valleys; and he was then refreshed with bread of heavenly purity and whiteness.

Anselm's changes of abode corresponded exactly with those of Lanfranc. From Italy he migrated into Normandy; in 1059 he settled at Avranches, and thence followed Lanfranc to Bec, where, in 1060, he took the cowl, and where he succeeded Lanfranc as Prior in 1063. At Bec he abode for no less than thirty-three years—three as a simple monk, fifteen as Prior, and fifteen as Abbot. It was owing to his visits to his friend Lanfranc at Canterbury, when he came to see the lands which the abbey of Bec possessed in England, that he became connected with this country; he was admitted a member of the Primate's new monastery of Christ Church, and made the deepest impression by his piety and learning alike upon the monks, upon the great King, and, in fact, upon the nation generally;[1] so that, when

[1] 'There was no Count in England,' writes Eadmer, 'or Countess, or powerful person, who did not think they had lost

Lanfranc died, there was but one opinion as to who was the proper man to be his successor; and in 1093 Anselm, at the ripe age of sixty, became Archbishop of Canterbury. It might seem that, if anyone could tame the evil spirit of William II., Anselm would be the man. William I. lost all his harshness, and became meek as a lamb, under his hands; and even William II. listened with practical effect to the Archbishop's counsels when he thought that he was on his death-bed; but William II. was not a William I., and, it may be added, Anselm was not a Lanfranc. Immeasurably superior in point of genius, and of a higher type of saintliness, he was yet perhaps not so well endowed with that practical wisdom which enabled Lanfranc to guide the bark of the Church with safety and honour amid the rocks and quicksands which were about its course. It is no wonder that a violent collision between the civil and the ecclesiastical powers ensued. The seeds of discord had been sown, and were bound to spring up; they would have sprung up long before, but for the harmony of counsel that had always prevailed between the Conqueror and Lanfranc. On the one side was a strong monarchy, resolved, in this respect at any rate, to follow the line of the English rule it had displaced, in that it would suffer no foreign power to interfere in England. On the other side was a growing ecclesiasticism which derived its inspiration from Rome, and made its ultimate appeal to Rome. William represented the one, Anselm the other.

Even before Anselm's consecration there were

merit in the sight of God, if it had not chanced to them at that time to have done some service to Anselm, the Abbot of Bec.'

symptoms of the approaching storm. Anselm met the King at Rochester in the summer of 1093, and told him plainly that he could only accept the archbishopric on three conditions: (1) That all the lands belonging to the see in Lanfranc's time should be restored; (2) that the King should see justice done in respect to lands upon which the see had a long-standing claim; (3) that in matters pertaining to God the King should take him for his spiritual father and counsellor, while he would own the King as his earthly lord. He added that he had already, together with the whole Norman Church, accepted Urban, and not his rival, Clement, as the true Pope, and that he could not alter his choice. The King only promised that the lands which belonged to the see in Lanfranc's time should be restored; so, when Anselm was consecrated, December 4, 1093, there were already some unsettled points between him and the King which were sure to cause dispute.[1]

Other points of difference immediately arose. A war was declared with Robert, Duke of Normandy, and the chief men offered their contributions towards the expense. Anselm offered 500 marks, which was represented to the King as too mean a sum, and was ultimately rejected. Anselm was no miser, but he had a sensitive conscience, and he gladly took the rejected gift back, and distributed it among the poor; for he feared it might have been regarded as a price paid for the archbishopric. Then he felt it his duty to rebuke vice both in the King and in the courtiers; he boldly told the King that he must not

[1] In his passion, William said in this year 1093: 'Nec ipse (Anselm) hoc tempore, nec alius quis archiepiscopus erit me excepto' (Eadmer, 'Hist. Nov.,' p. 30).

expect success in any expedition unless he aided in reviving the drooping Christianity of the land. He asked leave to hold a synod for the remedy of moral and ecclesiastical evils. This was refused. He then remonstrated with the King on the evil done to religion by the prolonged vacancies of abbacies, and thereby exasperated William all the more.

In all this Anselm was only performing the part of a faithful pastor; but now arose a formal question on the point of jurisdiction. He had been Archbishop for more than a year, and had not received the pallium, so he asked leave of the King to go to Rome and fetch it. 'From which Pope?' asked the King. Anselm reminded him of what he had stated at Rochester, that, as he had already accepted Urban, he could not alter his choice. The King then said, what was perfectly true, that it had been decided in his father's time that no Pope should be acknowledged in England without the consent of the Sovereign. To settle the knotty point, a great national council was held at Rockingham in March, 1095, the King not being present. Anselm asked the assembly whether there was any real incompatibility between his allegiance to the King and his obedience to Urban, and when he could extract no satisfactory answer, he uttered the memorable words: 'For the things which are God's I will give obedience to the Vicar of the blessed Peter; to things touching the dignity of my lord the King, I will to the best of my ability give him faithful counsel and help.' On this ground he took his stand; he repeated the same sentiment in different language on many days, and matters seemed to be at a dead-lock. The courtier-

prelates were against him, and counselled submission to the King; but the lay-lords were in the end on his side, and so was the popular feeling generally. The particular point at issue was settled by William learning, through two messengers[1] whom he had expressly sent to Rome, that Urban was really the Pope in possession, and by the pallium being sent to England by a Papal Legate (the Bishop of Albano); but no general principle had been laid down, and the dispute was sure to break out afresh.

Passing over many wearisome details, we find Anselm, after having in vain urged the King to set about the work of reform, asking for his license to go to Rome in order to appeal to the Pope for a redress of his own wrongs and those of the Church. The license was persistently asked for over and over again, and of course as persistently refused, till at last Anselm declared publicly in a Gemot at Winchester, October, 1096, that 'for the sake of his own soul, for the sake of religion, and for the King's own honour and profit, it was needful he should go; and if the King would not grant leave he must go without it, obeying God rather than man.' But here both laymen and ecclesiastics were against him. He had sworn to obey the customs of the realm; and the custom of the realm was that no one in his position should quit the country without the King's leave. Anselm was firm, and at length obtained the King's reluctant permission to go. A sort of quasi-reconciliation took place; before Anselm's departure the

[1] Both of whom afterwards became famous men—Gerard, subsequently Archbishop of York; and William of Warelwast, subsequently Bishop of Hereford. They were at the time clerks of the Chapel Royal.

King consented to receive his blessing, and the two never met again on earth.[1]

The dispute was complicated during William's lifetime by personal matters which were beside the point at issue. No man in Anselm's position could do his duty to the King and to the Church without setting his face against the abominable immorality which now prevailed under the bad example of the King and his persistent efforts to rob and depress the Church;[2] and Anselm's faithful effort to amend morals had given at least as much offence as his deference to the Pope. The real question, as it affected the relations between Church and State, comes out far more clearly in the next reign, when it was not so much entangled with side-issues.

Anselm had been received at Rome with the utmost honour, Urban introducing him as 'the Patriarch of another world,' and paying him compliments which quite embarrassed the modest man. He was enabled to do the Pope and the Western Church generally a great service. For during his visit the Council of Bari was held, A.D. 1098, at which the profound question which lay at the root of the division between the Eastern and Western Churches was discussed

[1] Here for a third time we have an appeal to Rome, where our sympathies lean provokingly to the side of the appellant. As with Wilfrid, as with Robert, so with Anselm, patriotism draws us one way, a sense of right the other. This view of Anselm's case is admirably put by Dean Church in his 'Life of Anselm,' pp. 266-270. See also Joyce's 'Civil Power in its Relation to the Church,' p. 12, etc.

[2] 'God's Church he brought low, and the bishoprics and abbacies whose elders in his days fell, them all he either sold for money or kept them in his own hand, and farmed them out for rent, for that he would be the heir of every one, of clerk and of layman.'—Anglo-Saxon Chronicle.

with some Greek delegates who attended for the purpose. None of the Roman theologians could compare for a moment with Anselm in point of ability and theological learning. The Pope called upon him to speak, which he did in so masterly and convincing a way as to call forth the warmest expressions of gratitude. Urban also professed the deepest sympathy with him in his troubles in England, but took no practical step to redress his grievances.[1] The King of England was too powerful a monarch to be quarrelled with, even for the sake of the greatest and holiest prelate in Christendom.

Anselm lingered on at Rome in the vain hope of obtaining some satisfactory decision of his case, and was present at other councils, notably at that held in S. Peter's in 1099, at which he heard it decreed that excommunication should be pronounced against any layman who should bestow investiture of any ecclesiastical benefice, or any clerk who should receive it from lay hands. Anselm laid this decree deeply to heart, and at last left Rome *re infectâ*. He did not, however, return directly to England, but stayed in France on his way, no doubt anticipating, what actually occurred, that his arrival in England would involve him in fresh troubles. But meanwhile the English Church fared ill without its Primate; abuses grew more and more glaring; he was naturally wanted, as the second power in the realm, when

[1] It is only fair to add that the council is said to have unanimously urged the excommunication of the Red King; and the Pope was only prevented from excommunicating him by Anselm's own entreaties. So, at least, says Eadmer; but Dean Church thinks that the whole thing was merely a demonstration, and that the Pope never seriously intended a breach with England ('S. Anselm,' p. 278).

William died and Henry succeeded him;[1] and the most earnest entreaties, in which the new King joined, were sent to him to come back and relieve his afflicted Church. At last he returned, and the expected difficulty at once arose. William II. had seized upon the temporalities of the see of Canterbury in the Archbishop's absence, and before they could be restored Anselm must, according to the customs of the country, do homage to Henry I. He had made no scruple about doing homage to William when he first accepted the archbishopric, but now the decree of the Roman council rankled in his mind; he had heard such a proceeding implicitly condemned at the centre of Christendom, and he could not violate a decree issuing from such a source. Moreover, his experience of the outrages which William II. had inflicted upon the Church made him feel that to place Christian bishops 'under the heel of feudal royalty'[2] was to betray the interests of the Church. Matters seemed to be again at a dead-lock. Some bishops endeavoured to cut the Gordian knot by declaring that, though the Pope had sanctioned the decree of the Council, he was ready to make an exception in favour of the island Church. This seemed extremely improbable, but an embassy was sent to Rome to inquire whether it was true. The embassy returned, bringing back an indignant repudiation from Pope Paschal, who had by this time succeeded Urban, of any such intention.[3]

[1] See Church, p. 287.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 278.

[3] The Pope's letter was addressed to Anselm; the King would not hear it read, and Anselm would not open it, lest he should be thought to have tampered with its contents; so it was not read until some months later, when Anselm had again left England.

Meanwhile, Anselm was firm, and he had the popular feeling on his side. Indeed, some of the King's own nominees to bishoprics were scrupulous. As Anselm would consecrate no bishops on the King's terms, the task was devolved upon the next highest functionary, Gerard, Archbishop of York. But two, at least, flatly refused to be consecrated by Gerard.

In the spring of 1103, Henry and Anselm met at Canterbury, and it was decided that Anselm should once more go to Rome and try to arrange matters with the Pope; and the Easter Gemot, held at Winchester, approved the decision. At Rome, William of Warelwast pleaded the cause of the King, or, rather, stated the King's views, ending with the not very conciliatory utterance, 'Know all men present that not to save his kingdom will King Henry lose the investiture of the churches.' 'And before God,' replied the Pope, taking up the defiant tone, 'not to save his head will Pope Paschal let him have them.' This was not promising; it seemed as if a settlement of the dispute was further off than ever. But, as a matter of fact, both King and Pope appear to have been inclined to make a compromise, and both were rather embarrassed by the inflexibility of Anselm, who determined to have the matter finally settled before he would return to England and resume his primatial functions. He stayed nearly two years in France, in spite of pathetic entreaties from home that he would return. He had an interview in Normandy both with King Henry himself and with Queen Matilda, and at length returned to England, and the long and weary dispute was settled at a great national council in London in 1107. The settlement was certainly in one sense a compromise, but it was a

very reasonable one. The King gave up the right of investiture; the spiritual authority, symbolized by the ring and crozier, was only to be conferred by spiritual persons. The Pope waived the question of homage; for their temporal possessions the bishops were to profess themselves 'the King's men' in the same way as other holders of property.

Anselm now resumed all his functions. He consecrated the bishops who had refused to be consecrated by the Archbishop of York.[1] In spite of his seventy-four years, he set about the sorely-needed work of reform with a vigour and success which make us regret all the more the long time spent in disputes. He strove to enforce the canons which had been framed at the Council of London against simony, and against the marriage of the clergy; he roused the King to put down sternly the crime of false coining, and the outrages which his followers had been wont to commit when they attended him on his progresses; he divided the unmanageable see of Lincoln by carving out of it a new diocese, of which Ely was the centre; he maintained successfully the supremacy of Canterbury over York. And yet he found time for literary work which no man of his time was equally competent to do, and for correspondence with persons in all parts, who, owing to his great reputation for sanctity and learning, sought his counsel.

Anselm was by far the most powerful and profound writer that had ever yet appeared in the English Church. His 'Cur Deus Homo' is still a

[1] He consecrated William Giffard to Winchester, Reinhelm to Hereford, Roger to Sarum, and William of Warelwast, his old opponent at Rome, to Exeter.

locus classicus on the Incarnation; his 'Monologia' is a marvel of ingenuity in proving the existence of a God from the inherent nature of things, without having recourse to Holy Scripture or Church authority; his 'Proslogia,' its companion piece, anticipates the famous argument of Descartes for the existence of God, and shows how far Anselm was, intellectually, in advance of his age; and his other theological and philosophical writings are masterpieces in their way; while the pious soul will nowhere find a fuller and better expression of its devout feelings than in the practical and devotional works of S. Anselm.[1] On April 21, 1109, he passed away, leaving a reputation which increased as the years rolled on. There is no saint in the mediæval Church whose name stands higher than his does. He has been peculiarly fortunate in his biographers. His first was his own domestic chaplain and most confidential friend and companion, Eadmer, whose two 'Lives,' both in their faithfulness and their literary merit, rise far above the average of mediæval chronicles, having all the vividness and freshness which an eye-witness of the events which he recounts alone can impart, and being quite free from that fulsome and indiscriminate praise which the humble retainer is apt to lavish upon his master. His last biographer was one of the ablest and most graceful writers of the nineteenth century—the late Dean Church.

The reign of Henry I. was honourably distinguished by the creation of two new bishoprics. There had been no increase of the episcopate since the days of

[1] For an account of Anselm's literary work, see Dean Church's monograph, pp. 82-88.

Edward the Elder, and there was to be no further increase until the time of Henry VIII. Ely and Carlisle stand alone as the sees erected during a period of eight hundred years. Ely has been already mentioned. The diocese of Carlisle was formed because Cumberland had lately come under the dominion of the King of England. Both sees were created for the very sufficient reason that the dioceses to which they respectively belonged—Lincoln and York—were too large for proper supervision.

But the extension of the monastic system is a far more prominent feature of the period before us than the increase of the episcopate. It is to be feared that this cannot be regarded as an indication of the general increase of piety, but rather of the reverse. It was the growing turbulence and lawlessness of the barons and their retainers that rendered necessary and acceptable these peaceful retreats, where pious souls might find kindred surroundings which they could not find in the outer world, and where the weak and helpless might find a refuge from the violence and outrage which they were only too likely to experience outside the convent walls.[1]

The old abbeys were strengthened. Henry de Blois, for instance, nephew of Henry I., and subsequently Bishop of Winchester, recovered many of the possessions of Glastonbury, of which he was Abbot, and added greatly to the magnificence of its buildings ; Crowland, after having suffered, first from earthquake and then from fire, was restored on a

[1] Montalembert protests against the *general* view that monasteries were chiefly used as refuges for the weak and the distressed, and he has much to say for his opinion, but at the time we are now considering there is little doubt that they were thus used.

sumptuous scale; Abingdon was greatly enriched, and its buildings enlarged; so also was St. Edmundsbury, Tewkesbury, Chester, and others.

The number of new orders that established their systems, with more or less success, in England during the twelfth century, without at all injuring the prosperity of the old Benedictine abbeys, is perfectly marvellous.

First came the Cluniac, a reformed Benedictine order, founded two centuries earlier by Odo, at Clugny, in Burgundy, but scarcely known in England until the Normans strove to introduce it. The attempt, however, was not very successful; it was regarded as a French rather than English order, and, with the exception of Lewes—where it was under the special protection of Earl Warrenne, son-in-law of William the Conqueror, and for some time Abbot—and Bermondsey, there were few abbeys of any note belonging to this order in England.

Far otherwise was it with the Cistercians, who found here a most congenial soil in which to plant themselves. Though the Cistercian order, like the Cluniac, was founded in Burgundy—at Citeaux, between Dijon and Chalons—its chief founder[1] was an Englishman, born and bred, named Harding, who received his own training in the monastery of Sherborne, his native place. But as, according to a general custom, he took another name when he became a monk, and was canonized as S. Stephen, his English origin is not apparent in his name. He presided over Citeaux until A.D. 1113, when a far

[1] The first who attempted the foundation of Citeaux was Robert, Abbot of Molesme, in Burgundy, but he could not enforce the stricter discipline enjoined.

greater man—S. Bernard—arrived and made Cistercianism flourish.[1] The Cistercian, like the Cluniac, was intended to be, not a new order, but merely a reformed Benedictine. It was introduced into England, in 1128 or 1129, by William Giffard, Bishop of Winchester, who founded the Cistercian abbey of Waverley, near Farnham. This was followed, in 1131, by the foundation of Tintern, on the Wye, now perhaps, in its ruins, the loveliest of all the dismantled abbeys in England. The next year saw the foundation of Rievaulx; then followed Byland; and then the most sumptuous foundation of all—Fountains Abbey, near Ripon, which arose from the migration, in 1132, of thirteen monks from S. Mary's, York, who desired to observe a stricter rule, and were encouraged in their desire by Thurston, the great Archbishop of York. Furness in Lancashire, Jervaulx and Kirkstall in Yorkshire, Melrose, on its new foundation—in fact, more than a hundred abbeys, many of them among the most famous in England—belonged to this order. What constitutes their most striking feature to the outward eye is that they are not, like most of the older abbeys, built in cities and under the shadow of cathedrals, but in rural solitudes, which they either found or made the most picturesque and fertile spots in England. The Cistercians strictly followed the Benedictine rule of labour, and seem to have almost held a monopoly of sheep-farming. Unlike other orders, their churches were distinguished by a severe simplicity of style and bare-

[1] So thoroughly was the success of the Cistercians identified with S. Bernard, that in France and Germany they were often called Bernardines.

ness of ornament. They soon became by far the most important order of their day.

The Carthusian order arose towards the close of the eleventh century, but did not reach England till the later part of the twelfth, when the Carthusian house of Witham, in Somerset, was founded, in 1181, by Henry II., in part fulfilment of his vow to build three monasteries as a penance for the murder of Becket. But, like the Cluniac, it was never more than an exotic in England, and, with the exception of what is now called, by a truly English corruption, 'the Charterhouse,' it had no foundation of any great note.

Besides these new orders of monks, there were several kindred institutions which date their introduction into England from the twelfth century. Among these were the Augustine Canons, or, to speak more accurately, the Augustine Canons regular, for the Augustine Canons secular were in England much earlier. These first came into England in the reign of Henry I., and flourished rapidly in every part of the kingdom. Houses on this foundation were established at St. Osyth's in Essex, at Plympton in Devonshire, at Leicester, at Walsingham in Norfolk, at Carlisle, at St. Bartholomew's in London, at Cirencester, at Kenilworth, at Newstead in Notts, at Osney in Oxon, at Bridlington and Nostell in Yorkshire—in fact, their number is said to have been not less than 173. They followed, not the rule of S. Benedict, but that of S. Augustine of Hippo. Hence their name.

The only purely English order, that of the Gilbertines, founded by Gilbert of Sempringham in 1148, was, strange to say, far less successful than

some of foreign importation. This, like the last-mentioned, was an order of regular canons rather than of monks proper; it also included women, who were to live—of course apart—like the Cistercian nuns. Lincolnshire, the native county of its founder, and Yorkshire, were the chief homes of this foundation; but it never flourished widely.

Another order, which also had its first English home in Lincolnshire, where it was introduced about the year 1146, was that of the Præmonstratensians.[1] They were a kind of reformed Augustines, and numbered about thirty-five houses, the chief of which was at Welbeck in Notts.

To the same period belongs the institution of the two military orders which resulted from the Crusades, that of the Hospitallers, or Knights of S. John, who had a rich and prosperous house near Smithfield Bars, in London, and other houses, called 'commanderies,' in various parts of the country; and that of the Knights Templars, who came to England in the reign of Stephen, and made their headquarters in London, where the Temple Church still perpetuates their name. These, too, had houses in different parts, called 'preceptories.'

The establishment of these new orders, especially of the Cistercians, who were by far the most powerful, tended, at least, to keep up the idea of the spiritual life, which was in danger of being well-nigh lost amid the endless ecclesiastical disputes which were now rife. The compromise arranged between the King and the Pope on the matter of investitures was very far indeed from settling the contest between

[1] So called from Premonstre, in Picardy, where the order was founded in 1121, by Norbert, a German.

the Papal claims and the claims for the independence of the National Church. That contest, in one shape or another, went on all through the long reign of Henry I.; and, in spite of the vigour and ability of the King, and the harmony in which he and Archbishop Ralph, Anselm's successor, worked together, the result was a gradual but sure advance on the part of Rome. One of the issues on which the battle was fought was that old bone of contention as to the supremacy of the Southern over the Northern metropolitan see. The nomination of Thurstan, a strong and determined man, to York brought matters to a head. Ralph, Archbishop of Canterbury, resolutely declined to consecrate him unless he would make the usual profession of subordination to Canterbury. Thurstan as resolutely refused to do so, and appealed to Rome. This gave the Pope his chance; he consecrated Thurstan himself, assisted by some French bishops, at the Council of Rheims in 1119. It is easy to perceive the wisdom of the Papal policy. Besides the natural eagerness to interfere in the affairs of England, and thus bring its Church more closely into the Roman obedience, the particular question at issue was one which, on the *divide et impera* principle, it would be in the interest of Rome to settle in favour of Thurstan. For, if two co-ordinate powers were recognised instead of the one *papa alterius orbis*, it would be next to impossible to hold a national council, and a national council was the greatest hindrance to the power of Rome.[1] The

[1] By 'national council' is, of course, meant a council of the whole National Church, as opposed to a provincial or a diocesan council. For some excellent remarks on this subject, see Bishop Stubbs' 'Const. Hist.,' *in loco.*

incident, moreover, occurred just at the time when Rome was complaining loudly of the unfilial conduct of her daughter in the distant island, who was incessantly rebelling against the mother's authority, and rejecting her counsels. The King of England, however, would naturally regard the matter from a different point of view. Henry was the last man to submit to an insult; he would not receive Thurstan into his kingdom nor listen to the prayer of Pope Calixtus II. on his behalf. But in the following year (1120) Thurstan rendered a service to the King by negotiating a peace with the French, and was allowed to return as Archbishop of York; so the Pope carried his point, after all, and another nail was driven into the coffin of English liberty. Calixtus improved the occasion by issuing a Bull to free York for ever from obedience to Canterbury.

A curious episode occurred in connection with this dispute. The archbishopric of St. Andrew's—the 'bishopric of Scotland,' as it was sometimes called *par excellence* — fell vacant, and in 1120 Alexander, King of the Scots, asked Ralph, Archbishop of Canterbury, to send him his monk Eadmer. Eadmer was duly elected by the chapter, but (probably at the instigation of Ralph himself) he refused to be consecrated by any but the Archbishop of Canterbury. The King would not allow this, and Eadmer, after a long stay in the monastery of St. Andrew's, returned to Canterbury, and wrote to King Alexander resigning all claim to the see.

In 1122 Ralph was succeeded by William of Corbeil, and the Pope took advantage of the change to make another encroachment upon the independence of the English Church. A Papal Legate, John of

Crema, arrived in England, who not only exercised legatine functions, but actually superseded the Archbishop of Canterbury in his own cathedral church on the greatest festival of the Christian year. Upon this Archbishop William made a journey to Rome, and came back invested with the powers of Legate in his own person. The Archbishop of Canterbury had always been regarded as *Legatus natus*, or a representative of the Apostolical See in England, though the title was not formally given until the Pope confirmed it to the next Archbishop, Theobald, and his successors; but this was a very different matter: the legatine authority was now conferred upon the individual, not necessarily in virtue of his primacy, and the results appeared in the next reign.

CHAPTER VII.

THE MEDIÆVAL CHURCH.

From the Accession of Stephen to the Vassalage of John (1135-1213).

Church in Stephen's reign bound closer to Rome—New monasteries erected—Bishops secularized—Theobald, Archbishop of Canterbury—Henry de Blois, Bishop of Winchester, Papal Legate—King tried by his own subject—Thomas Becket in Theobald's household—Recommended by the Archbishop to Henry II.—Made Chancellor—Consecrated Archbishop and gave up Chancellorship—Determined to fight the Church's battle—Popular feeling on his side—Council and Constitutions of Clarendon—Appeal to the Pope—Council of Northampton—Flight of Becket to Pontigny—Meeting with Henry at Montmirail—Henry's son crowned by Archbishop of York—Becket's return from exile—Scene at Canterbury on Christmas Day—Murder of Becket—Henry wished to reform real abuses—Walter de Map—S. Hugh of Lincoln—Gilbert Foliot—John of Salisbury—Osmund, Bishop of Salisbury—'Sarum Use'—Richard, Archbishop of Canterbury—Destruction of Canterbury by fire—Dispute between the two metropolitans—Baldwin, Archbishop of Canterbury—The Crusades, and their influence on the English Church and State—Richard I.—Government under William Longchamp and Hugh Walter—King John—Feudal vassal of Rome—End of a policy.

THE riveting of the fetters which had been forged in the previous period of her history now proceeded with marvellous rapidity, until at length the National Church seemed to be all but denationalized, being bound hand and foot to Rome.

In 1135 the great King died, and the weakness of his successor was turned, as usual, to the strengthening of the influence of the Pope in England. Stephen, in the charter which he issued immediately after his coronation, described himself as having been crowned 'by the Lord William, the Archbishop of Canterbury and *the Legate of the Holy Roman Church*,' and as having been 'confirmed in his kingdom by Innocent, Pontiff of the Holy Roman Church'—language very different from that which had been used by his predecessors. During the nineteen troubled years of his reign, no less than 154 monasteries were erected, all of which would be so many *points d'appui* for strengthening the hold of Rome over England; and all the more so because the spiritual power of the regulars must have been greatly increased by the 'secularization of the seculars.' The bishops of the period seem to have been in effect simply barons, who took an active part in the incessant little wars which one baron waged against another; their lives really belong to secular, not to ecclesiastical history; and for this reason it has not been thought necessary to dwell upon the career of one who was, in a sense, the most prominent ecclesiastic of his day, Roger, Bishop of Sarum, the justiciar and general adviser of Henry I., and still a powerful man in the days of Stephen, but purely a statesman, not a Churchman.

At the same time, it must be remembered that it was by the efforts of the Church that England was rescued from an utter chaos of misrule.[1] The Church knew its power, and exercised it, on the whole, for good. From the very commencement of his reign

[1] On this point, see Green's 'Short History,' ch. ii., § 7.

Stephen strove to conciliate the clergy, though he did not always succeed in doing so.[1] At the Easter meeting held at Oxford in 1136, he promised to renounce all claim to the properties of intestate clergymen, to repress all simony, and to confirm the Church in the possession of all estates it had enjoyed by an uncontested title since the death of the Conqueror, or which had since been conferred.

All the bishops were certainly not of the secular type. The new Primate, among others, was an exception. Theobald was the third Archbishop of Canterbury who had been supplied to the Church by the abbey of Bec; and when we remember that the other two were Lanfranc and Anselm, we need not inquire further what his training had been. Moreover, he had come much under the influence of the new order of the Cistercians, and had, indeed, attached himself to the greatest of them all, Bernard of Clairvaux; so we may well believe him to have been a spiritually-minded man. He was appointed to the archbishopric of Canterbury in 1139, to the great surprise of everyone; for it was generally expected that Henry de Blois, Bishop of Winchester and brother of the King, through whose instrumentality Stephen had reached the throne, and who was then the most powerful man in England, would have succeeded to the primacy as a matter of course. But Theobald fully justified the choice. He left his mark on the Church of England in more ways than one. He was 'the real founder of the mediæval

[1] It was at a council largely consisting of clergy that Matilda was elected 'Lady of England' after the defeat of Stephen at the battle of Lincoln in 1141. See Bishop Stubbs' 'Early Plantagenets,' p. 22.

canon law jurisprudence in England';[1] he did away with the maladministration of the archdeacons, which had become so glaring that it caused John of Salisbury (Theobald's secretary) to propose the question, 'Is it possible for an Archdeacon to be saved?'; he so ordered his household that it kept up the tradition of learning in the Church of England during a period of great darkness. But the new Primate found himself, thanks to the unpatriotic conduct of his predecessor, in a strangely anomalous and embarrassing position. The Pope had established his claim to appoint whom he would as his Legate in England; and, instead of appointing Archbishop Theobald to the office, he invested Henry de Blois with a legatine commission; and in virtue of that commission the suffragan could claim precedence over his Archbishop—a thing unheard of.

The whole time, however, was one of anarchy and confusion. Soon afterwards we find the King himself being tried by his own subject. He had violently seized possession of the castles, and even of the persons, of three of the most warlike of his warlike prelates, Salisbury, Lincoln, and Ely, and for this act he was tried by his brother, Henry of Winchester, acting as Papal Legate. To make confusion worse confounded, the matter was settled by a foreigner, the Archbishop of Rouen, who could not have the faintest pretension to exercise any jurisdiction in England, but who seems to have been appealed to as a sort of *amicus curiæ*. The Arch-

[1] Bishop Stubbs' 'Lectures on Medieval and Modern History,' lecture xiii., p. 301.

bishop argued, with grim irony, that before it could be asked whether the King had any right to seize the castles of the bishops, a previous question arose, 'Had the bishops a right to have any castles? Was it consistent with the canons of the Church?' The ridiculous compromise at last arrived at was that the King should retain the episcopal castles, but do penance for retaining them!

Amid this topsy-turvy condition of affairs, of which the above-mentioned trial is a notable specimen, Archbishop Theobald's own home was the resort of all the learning and ability of the kingdom;[1] and in that home the most conspicuous figure, who soon became to all intents and purposes the master of *his* master, was young Thomas Becket, in whom the Archbishop had the sagacity to discern the makings of a great man. We can well understand how the rise of Becket would be regarded with jealousy; for he had no particular advantages of birth, being the son of Gilbert Becket, a simple London citizen; he had not distinguished himself by any extraordinary advancement in learning—he never *did* become a really great scholar or divine. His merits were a striking person, a ready wit, an affable demeanour to all, a readiness to undertake and carry out with promptitude any service that might be entrusted to him, and an indomitable courage. Theobald sent his protégé to Bologna to study the canon law, which he desired to introduce into England. Becket remained for a year at Bologna, where

[1] 'The household of Archbishop Theobald, in the reign of Stephen, to some extent satisfied the want which was afterwards met by the University system.'—Bishop Stubbs' 'Lectures on Medieval and Modern History,' lecture vii., p. 142.

Gratian himself, the great expounder of the canon law, was lecturer, and then, having spent some time at Auxerre in the same study, returned to England. Theobald employed him in more than one delicate negotiation with the Court of Rome, which Becket managed admirably, and made him his Archdeacon. There is little doubt that it was through the adroit influence of Becket that Theobald ventured to defy the royal prohibition, and to attend a council at Rheims, in 1148, to which Pope Eugenius III. summoned all Cisalpine bishops, and at which that Pope ventured to threaten the whole kingdom of England with an interdict.

In 1154 the weak and troubled reign of Stephen ended, and the strong reign of Henry II. began. Archbishop Theobald recommended his faithful Archdeacon to the new King's service, probably under the impression that he would thereby secure a powerful instrument at Court to carry out all his good designs; but, if he thought this, he made precisely the same mistake which the King himself made some years later. Becket was one of those enthusiasts who throw themselves heart and soul into the cause or work they have in hand, whatever it may be. When he was the Archbishop's man, he identified himself completely with the Archbishop; when the King's man, with the King; when he devoted himself more exclusively to the service of a greater One than either, then, for what he thought to be to the glory of Him, he was ready to sacrifice his ease, his interests, his life.

In 1155 the young King made Becket his Chancellor, a most responsible office, for 'the Chancellor was, in a manner, the Secretary of State for all

Departments.'[1] How admirably Becket acquitted himself in this office, and how thoroughly he won his master's confidence, it hardly falls within the scope of a Church history to tell; but it may be remarked that, though sumptuousness and display were lavishly indulged in by him, and quite harmonized with one side of his character, there is no stain whatever upon his morals during the six years that he held this half-secular, half-ecclesiastical post.[2]

In April, 1161, the good old Archbishop died, and Becket was chosen to succeed him at a council of the bishops of the province assembled in London. Whether the choice was made at the instigation of the King or not, it was evidently in accordance with Henry's pleasure, who is said to have abruptly announced to Becket: 'It is my will that you should be Archbishop of Canterbury.' Becket thought at first that he spoke in jest; but when he found that Henry really meant it, he is said to have told him plainly that such an appointment would put an end to the friendship between them.[3] He seems to have acted with perfect openness; he let matters take their course, and after a year's delay, caused partly by the very natural opposition to the appointment of one who was more a layman than a clergyman to the highest office in the English Church, he was consecrated Archbishop by Henry de Blois, Bishop of Winchester. The date of his consecration was

[1] Stubbs, 'Const. Hist.,' i. 381. See also Hook, ii. 365, 366.

[2] I say 'half-ecclesiastical' because the chancellorship was in those early times almost always held by an ecclesiastic, who was remunerated for his work solely by some Church preferment.

[3] The authority for this story is not very strong.

'the Octave of Whitsunday,' 1162—henceforth, by the ordinance of Becket himself, to be observed in England as a Festival in honour of the Holy and Undivided Trinity, and to be known as 'Trinity Sunday.'[1] His first act as Archbishop was to inform the King, to his extreme displeasure, that he was no longer his Chancellor,[2] and for the next eight years an incessant warfare, broken by one or two fitful intervals of amity, ensued between these two powerful natures.

To understand the course which the new Archbishop took, we must go back to the old days when he had been a humble retainer in the household of his predecessor. It should be remembered that side by side with the anarchy, and with the gross secularity among the higher officers of the Church, which prevailed in England during the reign of Stephen, there had been going on outside England a great ecclesiastical movement, which Becket had doubtless often heard discussed in the Archbishop's household. In 1139 Archbishop Theobald, his patron, had been present at the second Lateran Council, where the Pope, supported, if not instigated, by the great S. Bernard, had claimed a feudal superiority over all

[1] That is, I presume, it was through Becket that the recently adopted rule of observing a festival in honour of the Holy Trinity was observed on the Octave of Whitsunday, as in some churches, and not on the Sunday next before Advent, as in others. See Proctor's 'History of the Book of Common Prayer,' p. 293.

[2] 'The object at which Henry aimed was, perhaps, to unite the control of Church and State in a single office. But Becket defeated the project by resigning the chancellorship.'—Makower's 'Constitutional History of the Church of England,' ch i., § 4, p. 21. If this theory be correct, Henry's extreme displeasure was natural.

the clergy of Christendom. Becket heard the fame of S. Bernard from John of Salisbury, who had been introduced into the Archbishop's household by 'the last of the Fathers' himself. He had seen what *had* been done, and what *was* being done by the new Cistercian order, of which the same S. Bernard was chief. He felt, with the King, that a great reform was needed in the Church; but, unlike the King, he would be led by his early training to believe that the reform must be made by the Church itself, not by any secular authority. In short, just as when he was Theobald's 'man' he gave himself heart and soul to Theobald, and when he was the King's 'man' to the King, so now when he was the Church's 'man' he gave himself heart and soul to the Church; and he felt that, as Henry had really been placed on his throne by the Church, to the Church he was bound to submit.

No one was more embarrassed by the new attitude of the Archbishop than the Pope himself, who would fain have moderated the inconvenient ardour of his new friend; for he was at feud with the Emperor, and had no desire to throw into the arms of his foe so powerful a personage as the King of England. But such considerations had no weight with the enthusiastic Archbishop; he was there to fight the battle of the Church, and if the head of the Church was for temporizing, or for shirking the contest, more shame to him. By way of indicating his future policy, he applied to the Pope to canonize Anselm—a most embarrassing application, for the Pope could scarcely deny Anselm's title to canonization; but to canonize him at that particular time would seem to suggest that what Anselm had been to the first Henry, that Becket should be to the second.

The analogy was obvious, so far as the relationship of the two to the civil powers went, but there the resemblance ends. For learning and for saintliness Anselm ranks far above Becket; for brilliancy and effectiveness, perhaps Becket stands first.[1]

It is a curious instance of the little account which was taken of the popular feeling, that Becket is represented as having stood out, all alone, against the secular and ecclesiastical powers alike. Certainly the King was against him; the nobles were against him; his brother prelates were soon ranged against him; and he received only a very faint and qualified support, and sometimes actual disapproval, from Rome. But the people everywhere were enthusiastically in his favour; he was fighting for the liberty of the Church, and the liberty of the Church was, in their view, only another term for the liberty of the people.

The details of the struggles of those eight weary years must be briefly described. Passing over one or two preliminary skirmishes, we come to the great question which was discussed in a council at Westminster in October, 1163. King Henry stated his case most clearly and reasonably, dwelling upon a very real grievance which called for immediate redress. It was this: Under the name of 'clergy' were included, not only those who were in Holy Orders, but all who had received the tonsure; that is, nearly all who were in any way connected with the service of the Church—acolytes, grave-diggers, menial servants attached to convents as well as

[1] For an admirable sketch of the contrast between Anselm and Becket, see Freeman's 'Norman Conquest,' vol. v., ch. xxvii., pp. 662, 663.

churches, a most motley throng, many of whom, in the lawless days of King Stephen, had escaped the punishment they had richly deserved under the shelter of their profession.[1] Henry contended that no government could do its work effectively unless such men were made subject to the civil law, like any other citizens. Regarding the question from the King's point of view, one is only astonished at the modesty of his demand. But Becket regarded it differently; he had been studying the Roman canon law, which he wished to see introduced into England. The whole principle would be upset if once the State were allowed to interfere with the Church. The Church was quite strong enough to deal with her own offenders; if any were unworthy of being ranked among the clerical order, she could degrade them, and then the King's Court could deal with them as they deserved; but it must not punish them for the offence for which they had been degraded; that would be inflicting two punishments for one offence.[2] He could only consent to the King's proposal 'saving his order,' which, under the circumstances, meant that he could not consent to it at all. The bishops and abbots were with some difficulty won

[1] Stephen's charter (1136) made inferior clerks amenable to the ecclesiastical courts.

[2] 'It was the inalienable right of the clerk,' writes Dean Milman, 'to be tried only in the court of his Bishop, and as that court could not award capital punishment, the utmost penalties were flagellation, imprisonment, and degradation; and it was only after degradation, and for a second offence (for the clergy insisted on the injustice of a second trial for the same act), that the meanest of the clerical body could be brought to the level of the most high-born layman.'—'Latin Christianity,' book viii., ch. viii., p. 43.

over by Becket. Then the King, widening the question a little, asked them whether they would conform to the usages of his kingdom; but he could extract from Becket, as the mouthpiece of all, no other answer than, 'We will in all things, saving our order.'

Then followed a private interview between the King and the Primate at Northampton, which only exasperated the hostility between them. Becket, by his personal influence, had managed with difficulty to keep the bishops on his side, or at any rate to keep them from openly opposing him, at Westminster; but they did not really sympathize with him; nor did even the Pope, who wrote, as also did several Cardinals, entreating Becket, for the sake of peace, to comply with the wishes of the King. All the English dignitaries were clearly of the same mind, and Becket could not resist the universal feeling; so he went privately to the King at Woodstock and offered to withdraw the obnoxious phrase, 'saving our order.'

But Henry was a man of business; the qualification which practically upset his whole plan had been made in public, and in public it must be withdrawn. Hence arose the famous *Council of Clarendon*, held at the royal manor of Clarendon, near Salisbury, in January, 1164. This was not, properly speaking, an ecclesiastical council; it was attended by laity as well as clergy, and the result was the code known as the *Constitutions of Clarendon*, sixteen in number, drawn up by the Grand Justiciar, Richard de Luci. We can hardly be surprised that Becket stood aghast. It is true that the sixteen Constitutions merely stereotyped the principles laid down by

William the Conqueror and accepted by Lanfranc.[1] But, then, those were just the principles of which Becket, in his heart of hearts, disapproved. And it was one thing to have certain principles vaguely recognised as 'ancient customs of the realm,' quite another to have them distinctly formulated by the highest legal authority and solemnly accepted by a great national council, representative alike of laity and clergy. This, then, was all that he had effected by his resistance and subsequent compliance! He had been worried into receding from the grand position of 'Athanasius contra mundum'; and now the King, instead of beating the Church with rods, as at Westminster, was beating it with scorpions at Clarendon!

A scene occurred such as had never taken place at any of the mixed councils which had been common in England before the Conquest. The clergy were ranged on one side in support of their Primate, the laity on the other in support of their King. It was a sad example of the broken harmony between Church and State. Hot words were spoken; and it seemed at one time as if they were coming from words to blows. But this scandal was staved off by an unexpected change of front on the part of Becket himself which has never been satisfactorily explained.

[1] They purported 'to declare and place on record' some of the 'ancient liberties and customs of the Church of England.' In one of them (Article 8) it was declared that 'appeals, when necessary, ought to be from the Archdeacon to the Bishop, and from the Bishop to the Archbishop; and if justice were not done by the Archbishop, the last resort must be to the King, according to whose commandment the cause should be finally determined in the Archbishop's court without any further process, unless by the King's leave.'

He gave way, and the clergy followed his example. The Constitutions of Clarendon were signed, and after some hesitation, which threatened to lead to a further explosion, sealed. Becket seemed to have collapsed utterly, and the King to have won all along the line.

The Primate did not improve the dignity of his position by bitterly lamenting what he had done, and by sending to ask the forgiveness of the Pope for having betrayed the interests of the Church. It was a favourable opportunity for trampling upon the fallen prelate, and there were many ready to take advantage of it. The King himself applied for a legatine commission, which was to extend over the whole of England, for the Archbishop of York, with the obvious intention of humiliating Becket. Pope Alexander tried to please both parties—with the usual result. He sent a legatine commission to the King, with a permission to *him* to deliver it to the Archbishop of York; at the same time he wrote a painfully consolatory letter to Becket, which must have had the effect of exasperating him beyond endurance. The monks also of S. Augustine's, who had been from time immemorial at feud with the cathedral body and the Archbishop's own monastery of Christ Church at Canterbury, took occasion to assert their rights, and insisted upon having their new Abbot consecrated, not in the cathedral, but in the chapel of their monastery. And once more: Becket's old enemy, Bishop Gilbert Foliot, on being translated from Hereford to London, refused to make profession of obedience to the Primate, on the ostensible ground that, as London was in the same province as Hereford, there was no need for him to

repeat a profession already made; but really, no doubt, with the double object of asserting for London the old claims for metropolitan rights now that Canterbury was weak, and of casting a slur upon his fallen foe, for a fallen foe Becket certainly appeared to be.

The next scene in this strange drama is laid at Northampton, in the October of the same year, 1164, when Becket was cited to appear before another mixed council of laity and clergy. The object of the King seems now to have been simply to reduce the Primate to beggary. Becket was required to account for vast sums of money which he had spent in the King's service. All were against him; but he now played the part of the stag at bay. He boldly declared that what took place at Clarendon was, after all, done 'saving the honour of the Church.' The repetition (with a slight alteration) of the old qualification which had been the cause of all the troubles raised a storm of opposition; but as he left the gates of the castle, a long, loud shout of joy burst forth from the vast mob gathered round, who had feared that their champion had been murdered. Henry had triumphed; but he must have felt that there was a strong current of feeling setting in in favour of the vanquished.

Becket fled from England, and found a refuge in the Cistercian abbey of Pontigny, in France—an appropriate resting-place for one whose troubles had arisen from his adherence to those principles of which the Cistercians were the most notable exponents. Henry's hostility pursued him in his absence; he not only confiscated his property, but banished all his relations and dependents, including

all who had harboured him in his flight, and, by a refinement of cruelty, forced them to swear that they would go to Pontigny in order that the Archbishop might see with his own eyes the misery he had entailed upon those he loved best.

We pass over the famous anathemas which Becket (surely not without provocation) denounced against his enemies, excommunicating some, though not the arch-enemy of all, by name, in the church at Vizelay in 1166; and also his removal, owing to the intervention of Henry, from Pontigny to Sens, where he spent the remainder of his exile, under the protection of the King of France. He felt bitterly the scant support he had received from that Rome for which he had sacrificed everything. 'But for me,' he said, 'all authority of Rome would have ceased in England. There had been no one who had maintained the Pope against kings and princes.'

At last, in 1169, a meeting was arranged between Henry and Becket at Montmirail in the presence of the King of France, when Becket declared his willingness to yield everything 'saving the honour of my God,' a saving clause which, while perfectly unexceptionable in itself, must, when read in the light of the past, have appeared to mean that he would yield nothing at all. The King of France, Becket's protector, disapproved of the exception as much as the King of England; but the multitude did not. They met Becket on his return to Sens, and raised a shout of triumph for the man 'who defied two kings for the honour of his God.' Exactly the same feeling prevailed in England. King, prelates, nobles, might be against Becket; but the whole mass of the nation was on his side. After

some little fencing, it was arranged that Becket should return to England. He and Henry met once again in France, and apparently on their old terms of familiarity. Becket even ventured to touch upon the delicate subject of the coronation of the King's son, whom Henry, in defiance of the Primate's rights, and as a direct insult to the see of Canterbury, had had crowned by the Archbishop of York; and Becket actually obtained leave to inflict ecclesiastical punishment upon the offending prelate.

So Becket returned to his native country. He would take no precautions against the many enemies who, as he knew, awaited him in England. Nor, indeed, as the event showed, were any needed. The popular feeling was too strong to be resisted. When the vessel which bore the Primate was recognised by the Canterbury cross which floated from its prow, men rushed into the water to be the first to receive the blessing of the brave confessor who would dare all 'for the honour of his God.' When he landed, they prostrated themselves before him, and the cry went up, 'Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord!' At each village through which he passed on his way from Sandwich (where he landed) to Canterbury, the same cry was raised. The enthusiasm was as great at Canterbury itself. But here the Archbishop's first act was to seek the cathedral and prostrate himself on the pavement in silent thanksgiving, while the bystanders, who had thronged around him to seek his blessing, stood in awe-struck silence. The same reception met him when he went from Canterbury to London. There he was greeted with the *Te Deum*, the mighty multitude taking up the response with one voice. His return

to Canterbury was still one continued triumph. He is said to have dismounted from his horse to confirm children by the way.

Then came 'the beginning of the end.' It was Christmas Day, and the Archbishop was once more to celebrate Mass in his own cathedral. Before he went to the altar he preached from the text, 'On earth peace, good will towards men.' He reminded the vast congregation that there had been already one martyr among the Archbishops of Canterbury, and might soon be another. Then, in a voice of thunder, he inveighed against the King's council, against the prelates who had been concerned in the coronation of the King's son, and against other enemies; and then, having uttered the terrible words, 'May they be cursed by Jesus Christ! May the memory of those who sow discord between me and my lord the King be blotted out of the memory of the saints!' he dashed a taper on the pavement in token of their extinction, went up to the altar, and celebrated the Holy Eucharist.

Tidings of these events were brought to the King at Bayeux, who, in his mad rage, cried, 'Of the caitiffs who eat my bread, are there none to free me of this turbulent priest?' There were many who were only too ready to do so. Four knights who heard the words made straight for England, and on December 29, 1170, under circumstances too well known to need repeating, slew the Archbishop in his own cathedral. His last words were, 'For the Name of Jesus, and in defence of His Church, I am ready to die.'

That murder 'was worse than a crime: it was a blunder'—a most fatal blunder for those who were

striving in vain to stem the current which was all running in one direction. Becket's life, and still more Becket's martyrdom, were partly indications, partly causes, of what may be termed the denationalization of the Church of England. The process had commenced with the Norman Conquest, but the real drift had been concealed by the very tight hand which the Conqueror and his scarcely less strong assessor, Lanfranc, had kept both upon the Church and the nation. But the policy then introduced now bore its natural fruits; and the reason why so much space has been devoted to the story of Becket, is not because of its dramatic interest, but because of its important bearing upon this result. In the forcible language of one of our Church historians, 'Watered with Becket's blood, the Papal usurpation soon grew up to its full completement and perfection.'[1] The strangest part of the story is that the victory had been won for Rome, not merely with the faintest support, but even with frequent discouragement, from Rome itself. Well might Becket exclaim, 'Why is Rome so often for Barabbas, and not for Christ!' One would have thought that the great Apostolical See could scarcely have decreed without a blush the canonization of one who had fought her battles in spite of herself, one whom she had disappointed over and over again, one whom, instead of nerving for the contest he had waged almost single-handed, she had put off with fair words, without even stretching out a helping hand to save.

Henry II. has to thank his most indiscreet friends, who turned his foe into a Blessed Martyr, if posterity has been too apt to forget that the original quarrel

[1] Inett's 'Origines Anglicanæ,' ii. 281.

with Becket arose from a sincere desire on the King's part to reform Church abuses. It was surely to the interest of the Church itself that glaring scandals should be removed. And what scandal could be more glaring than the immunity from condign punishment which the grossest offenders against God and man managed to secure by sheltering themselves under their orders? The existence of these scandals is admitted on all hands; they form the chief subject of a new class of literature, of which Walter de Map is the most eminent representative. How much of the so-called Goliardic verse which appeared in the later part of the twelfth and the earlier part of the thirteenth centuries was really the work of Walter de Map is doubtful; but the famous Bishop Golias, who is a bitter satire upon the loose and worldly prelate of the period, is popularly supposed to be his creation; and the 'De Nugis Curialium,' which, though its title implies that it is only concerned with the doings of courtiers, is really a satire upon the Church more than upon the State, was undoubtedly his composition. The writer is especially severe upon the Church of Rome generally, and upon the Cistercian order in particular.[1] He was a protégé of Henry II., and a stanch adherent of the national party. He must therefore be taken as an *ex parte* writer; and, of course, a satirist has a wide license. But, making due allowance for all this, one cannot but feel (and the feeling is amply borne

[1] He had a bad opinion of the morals of the order. His friend Giraldus Cambrensis tells us that he always excepted the Jews and Cistercians from his oath to do justice to all men, since 'it was absurd to do justice to those who were just to none.'

out by other evidence) that he hits upon blots in the Church which required to be removed, and the removal of which was greatly retarded by the Becket disputes.

There were, however, prelates of the period as unlike as possible to the monster of Map's creation. S. Hugh of Lincoln, for example, was a contemporary in real life of the Bishop Golias of fiction, and was as noble a type of Bishop as any Church of any age can produce. He is an instance of Henry II.'s aptitude to recognise and appreciate in others that goodness which he was not always careful to practise himself; for the introduction into England and the advancement of this saintly man were entirely due to the King.

S. Hugh was born at Avalon, in Burgundy, about the year 1135, of a noble family. He spent his early life in the cloister, his father having entered a priory of regular canons at Villar-benoit when the boy was eight years old. He was ordained deacon at the age of nineteen by the Archbishop of Grenoble, and for a time served the mission chapel of S. Maxim. He then paid a visit to the Grande Chartreuse, having a desire to embrace a still more ascetic life. After a while he became a Carthusian monk, and in 1170 bursar of the monastery. The Carthusians made, as we have seen, but little way in England; and the small Carthusian monastery founded by Henry II. at Witham was not flourishing, when it was suggested to the King that if Hugh of Avalon were made Prior it might prosper. Henry with considerable difficulty obtained permission, through the Archbishop of Grenoble, for Hugh to come. And so, when he was at least forty years of age, our great English saint of the Middle Ages made his first appearance in

England. He succeeded in his work at Witham, and became an intimate friend and confidential adviser of the King. The way in which he managed his royal and wayward master forms a marked contrast to the relations between Henry and Becket. With his usual impetuosity Henry determined that Hugh of Avalon should be a Bishop; and in 1186, at a council held at Eynsham, he desired the canons of Lincoln to elect Hugh to their bishopric, which had been vacant for two years. We can hardly wonder that the canons should have demurred to the election of an unknown foreigner, over fifty years of age, who had only been in England for ten years; and yet they dared not disobey the King. S. Hugh, however, was not the man to allow himself to be forced upon an unwilling diocese, and he declared plainly that he would not accept the bishopric under such circumstances; he added that in any case he should have first to obtain the consent of the Prior of the Grand Chartreuse. Then the canons, admiring, perhaps, his spirit, elected him unanimously, and in the autumn of 1186 Lincoln received one of the greatest of her many great bishops. It is observable that Henry II., instead of being offended, as he generally was at the slightest thwarting of his will, appears to have behaved most amiably throughout. He insisted upon paying all the expenses incident to the consecration and enthronization; and when the new Bishop felt it to be his duty to excommunicate the King's chief forester, and to refuse to appoint to a prebend a courtier recommended by the King, Henry, though he flew *more suo* into a violent rage, was soon calmed down by Hugh, and actually approved of both acts. In the same spirit S. Hugh insisted upon

the removal of the body of Rosamond Clifford from the choir of the convent church at Godstow (then, of course, in the diocese of Lincoln), and its burial in the common cemetery, saying that religion makes no distinction between the mistress of a King and the mistress of any other person.[1] S. Hugh's conduct in his diocese reminds us of the days of Aidan and Chad and Cedd. His charity was unbounded; he tended with his own hands the poor lepers who abounded in that part of England; he was mainly instrumental in the rebuilding of Lincoln Cathedral, after its partial destruction by the earthquake of 1185. Like S. Chad and Cedd, he was wont to retire in the slack time of harvest to his old monastery to hold solitary communion with his God, and to receive strength for his work. In his dealings with his royal patron he showed a happy mixture of moral courage and wise tact, and he was one of the very few who could at all manage Henry's degenerate successors, both Richard and John. In 1200 the great Bishop died, having deserved, if any man did, the title of 'saint' which was conferred upon him in 1220.

It is a sad drop to turn from S. Hugh to any other prelate of the period. But there were some others who were, at least, not unworthy of their position. Among these it is especially necessary to do justice to the good qualities of a very prominent one, Gilbert Foliot; because his persistent and determined hostility to Becket has naturally led the panegyrists of that extraordinary man to represent his enemy in the darkest possible light. So far from being a worldly and sensual man of the Golias type, Foliot

[1] Lingard, vol. ii., ch. iii., p. 120.

was ascetic even to a fault; while his competency in point of abilities and learning is indisputable.[1] His rise was natural and gradual. He was of an old Norman family, related to the Earls of Hereford, and thus belonged to the class by which the majority of dignities, spiritual and secular, were then almost monopolized. He had been first monk and then Prior of the famous abbey of Clugny; then Abbot of Abbeville; then Abbot of Gloucester. In 1147 he was made Bishop of Hereford, and held that see for sixteen years, becoming a trusted counsellor of Henry II. In 1162 he had the moral courage to oppose the election of Becket to the primacy, and in 1163, when he became Bishop of London, he declined, as we have seen, to renew his professions of obedience to the Primate; in 1164, at the famous meeting at Northampton, his opposition led to an unseemly strife: he strove to wrest the cross from the Archbishop's hands, declaring that it was *his* right to carry it as Dean of the Province; and when he failed, he exclaimed, 'You have always been a fool, and always will be one.' In 1170 he joined with the Archbishop of York in crowning the King's son—an offence which appears to have rankled in Becket's breast more almost than any other. We can, therefore, well understand how unfavourably he would be judged by the partisans of Becket; and yet even *they* give us the impression that he was

[1] 'Foliot,' writes Dean Milman, 'was admitted to be a man of unimpeachable life, of austere habits (he was gently rebuked by Pope Alexander for fasting too rigorously), and of great learning. . . . All his letters reveal a Churchman as imperious and conscientious as Becket himself.'—'Latin Christianity,' vol. v., p. 37.

an able man who intended to do right. He was by no means a faultless character, but a strong and good man on the whole. He died in 1187, two years before the King, with whom he fully retained his influence to the last.

Another very eminent Churchman of the twelfth century, but quite of a different type from either Becket or Foliot, was John of Salisbury, an Englishman by birth, but trained, and afterwards promoted, abroad. He was first a learner, and then a teacher, in the University of Paris, at that time the chief seat of theological and philosophical lore; and, after many years' absence from his native country, became a member of the household of Archbishop Theobald at Canterbury, who loved to have learned men about him. He became Theobald's confidential adviser, and was entrusted by him with many delicate missions. 'The charge of all Britain, as touching Church matters, was laid upon me,' he writes in 1159. It was at the court of Theobald that he became intimately acquainted with Becket, to whom he proved a firm and faithful friend. He threw all the weight of his learning and character into the Archbishop's scale, to the great wrath of the King, who forced him again to quit the country; and we learn with indignation that, though he was the most learned man of his day, and of blameless character, he was often put to great straits for a bare maintenance. He was 'faithful' to Becket in more senses than one, for he told him plainly of his faults on more than one occasion.[1] He returned to

[1] For instance, he thought Becket was in danger of being drawn away from the devotional side of religion by his excessive attention to the study of Church law, and wrote to him: 'Pro-

England in 1170, and was with his friend at the time of his murder. When at last he was raised to the episcopate, it was not his own Church, but that of France, which had the honour of elevating him. In 1176 he became Bishop of Chartres, and held that office until his death in 1180. Bishop Stubbs describes him as 'for thirty years the central figure of English learning'; but to France, not to England, belongs the credit alike of training him and of recognising adequately his merits.

There was another great name connected with Salisbury in the twelfth century, that of Bishop Osmund, whose laudable attempt to introduce uniformity in the English Church is shown in the well-known 'Sarum Use,' which prevailed much more widely than any of the 'Uses' in the other dioceses, and is still yearned for by many Churchmen.

Becket's successor at Canterbury, Archbishop Richard, was, if not a great, at any rate a respectable Archbishop. As a monk of Christ Church, Canterbury, he attracted the attention of Archbishop Theobald, who made him his chaplain, and in Theobald's court he became acquainted with Becket; to the credit of both, the friendship there formed between them was not interrupted by subsequent differences of opinion. He next became Prior of S. Martin's, Dover, and there he remained quietly for more than thirty

sunt quidem leges et canones, sed mihi crede, quia nunc non erit his opus, *Non hoc ista sibi tempus spectacula poscit.* Siquidem non tam devotionem excitant, quam curiositatem. Quis e lectione legum, aut etiam canonum compunctus surgit? Plus dico: scholaris exercitatio interdum scientiam auget ad timorem, sed devotionem raro aut nunquam inflammat' (Epist. 138).

years, when he was called to the lofty but rather thorny post of Primate in room of the martyred Thomas. Party spirit was then hot, and the new Archbishop was upbraided by both sides, the King telling him that he ought to identify himself more thoroughly with the royal cause; the late partisans of Becket, that he was not maintaining the liberty of the Church which his predecessor had purchased with his life-blood. To add to his troubles, he witnessed the destruction by fire of his cathedral, that magnificent fabric which Lanfranc had raised; and he was involved, much against his will, in the old dispute concerning the relations between the two metropolitans. The Pope was appealed to, and, of course, eagerly embraced the opportunity of sending a Legate to England to settle the dispute. In 1176 a council was held at Westminster, at which a most undignified scuffle took place between the two archbishops. The blame seems clearly to have rested with the Archbishop of York; but the result was that the meeting broke up in confusion, without having settled anything. His successor, Archbishop Baldwin, was involved, not only in the old dispute between the cathedral and the monastery of S. Augustine, but also in a new one with the monks of Christ Church. He is remarkable as having been the first Archbishop of Canterbury who made a legatine visitation of Wales as part of the province of Canterbury, and also the first who took the Cross; and as he died in the Holy Land, where he was taking a part in the third Crusade, he may be regarded as a martyr to the cause.

The murder of Becket was far more effectual than all the efforts of his life had been to advance the

ecclesiastical power, and make it dependent upon Rome. His murderers were, in effect, playing into his hands, and weakening the hands of the master in whose interests they ostensibly did the cruel deed. Henry had, of course, to clear himself of all complicity in the murder, and the story of his pilgrimages to the shrine of the martyr, and of the flagellations to which he submitted himself there, is too well known to need repeating. But this was not all. Henry had to bow his spirit to still further degradations, and, in fact, to reverse the policy which he had been pursuing for more than a quarter of a century. The Pope, who had been but a lukewarm friend to Becket during his lifetime, was quite ready to avenge his death—and to turn it to his own profit. Legates were sent over to absolve the King, but before they did so Henry was forced to submit to them humbly as the Papal representatives, to make oath that he was in no way concerned in the death of the martyr, to renounce the Constitutions of Clarendon, and to swear adhesion to Alexander and renunciation of the Antipope.[1] As a further tribute to Becket's memory, Henry had his son crowned over again by the Archbishop of Rouen, not the obnoxious Archbishop of York. He also bound himself to maintain for a year two hundred knights for the defence of the Holy Land, and, unless he were excused by the Pope, to take the Cross himself.

This last condition introduces us to a subject which now for the first time becomes a substantive part of the history of the Church of England. That

[1] In 1172 Henry concluded at Avranches a formal contract with the Pope's Legate.

Church had hitherto been but little mixed up with the extraordinary outburst of religious enthusiasm which appeared in the Crusades. Of course, there had been numbers of Anglo-Normans who had taken the Cross, from the Conqueror's eldest son, Robert, downwards. And the effects of the Crusades upon the English Church are obvious in many ways. They had on the one hand drawn closer its connection with Rome; but on the other hand they had helped to weld together the nationality of the kingdom, and therefore of the Church. They also helped to introduce Oriental tastes, habits, and sciences into the West, which materially modified the English Church among others; and they diverted into a different channel that missionary zeal, which, as we have seen, was a notable and happy feature of the early English Church. But the island Church had not, *as* a Church, taken a leading part in the first two Crusades. In the third, however, and greatest, she came very prominently to the front. Henry II. promised, as we have seen, to visit the Holy Land. He never carried out his promise; but he helped the Crusade in other ways. He called a great council at Geddington (1188 A.D.), at which it was enacted that every man who did not join the Crusade should contribute handsomely towards its expense; and he extracted a large sum of money from the Jews, and left a large sum in his will for the object. His eldest surviving son, Richard—Henry, whose coronation had caused so much trouble, died before his father—was an enthusiastic Crusader, to the great detriment both of Church and State in England.

When the great King was gathered to his fathers

in 1189, his kingdom was practically left to govern itself, for the new King appears to have paid no attention to his country, except to extract from it all the money he could for the purposes of the Crusade. Then the Church came to the front, and instead of the warrior prelates of the age of Stephen, we now come to a period of statesmen prelates. As patriots, we may be thankful that *any* class was competent to rule our nation when it was left virtually without a ruler; but, as Churchmen, we must regret that abilities which would have been more appropriately devoted to the service of the Church were engrossed in the business of the State. If this incongruous part was to be played by ecclesiastics, we should naturally have expected that the person to take the helm in the King's absence would be the Primate of all England, whose position was far above that of any other subject. But the Archbishop was fired with the same ardour which burned in the heart of the King. He, too, must take the Cross; and the administration of the kingdom fell into the hands of William Longchamp, who had just been made Bishop of Ely and Chancellor of England. The King also made him share the office of Chief Justiciar with Hugh Poiset, Bishop of Durham, and gave him the custody of the Tower of London. He also received a commission from the Pope authorizing him to act as Legate for all England.

It is no part of Church history to describe the unpopular government of William Longchamp, nor that of his far more popular successor (as he may fairly be called), Hubert Walter, Archbishop of Canterbury; nor does it fall within our province to dwell upon the misgovernment of King John in

Church as well as in State. It may suffice to say that this misgovernment brought to a head what had long been gathering. The real tendency of the Church policy first commenced after the Norman conquest now appeared. Rome had ever since that time been making a steady, though fitful, advance in England. Her progress had not been visible when a strong King like the Conqueror himself, or the two Henrys, held the sway; but now, under the worst of all the kings and the greatest of all the popes, it reached it climax. John refused to accept the Pope's nominee as Primate, and endeavoured in every way to tyrannize over the Church. But Innocent III. was more than a match for him. In 1208 the kingdom was placed under an interdict; in 1209 the King was declared excommunicate; in 1211 the Pope threatened to absolve his subjects from their allegiance; in 1212 he proclaimed a Crusade against him. John was utterly cowed; he surrendered his kingdom, 'in favour of the Apostles Peter and Paul and the Church of Rome, into the hands of Innocent III. and his successors,' and bound himself to pay to the Pope an annual tribute of 1,000 marks sterling, in addition to the usual Peter's Pence. To add insult to injury, Pandulf, the Legate who was appointed to receive his surrender, was only a subdeacon. From him he received his kingdom back as a feudal vassal, swearing fealty and promising liege homage to the Pope. This was too much for Englishmen to bear, and the year 1213 is as real a turning-point in the history of the Church in England as the year 1534 itself; for then England saw the degrading spectacle of 'a King who wore the crown of Cerdic and William stooping to become

the man of the Roman Pontiff.'[1] The attitude of England towards Rome was changed; nor did England ever swerve from its new feeling towards the Apostolical See till the slight tie which bound them was irretrievably broken. 'From the moment of John's homage to Innocent begins that spirit of determined resistance to the encroachments of the Roman See which marks all English history from that day to this.'[2]

Here, then, is a fitting place to pause. The next chapter will open upon an entirely different view, so far as the real spirit of the National Church is concerned; and that view never changed. We make a break in the middle of a reign, in the middle of a primacy, in the middle of a papacy, but at the end of a policy.

[1] Freeman.

[2] Freeman's 'Norman Conquest,' vol. v., ch. xxvii., p. 705.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE MEDIÆVAL CHURCH.

From the Vassalage of John to the Death of Henry III.
(1213-1272).

Revolt against Rome—Stephen Langton, Archbishop of Canterbury—His conduct contrasted with that of King John—Pope's attitude towards Great Charter—Unpopularity of alliance between Pope and Kings John and Henry III.—Robert Grosseteste—Reforms diocese of Lincoln—Brought into collision with Rome—His learning, sanctity, and influence—Sewall de Bovill, Archbishop of York—Resistance to Rome on Roman grounds—Simon de Montfort—Barons' war — Pope for King, Church for barons — Rise of mediæval orders — Dominican and Franciscan friars — Grosseteste patron of Franciscans—Adam Marsh—Roger Bacon—Henry III. floods Church with foreigners—Aymer de Valence—Boniface of Savoy—Good side of Church in thirteenth century—Edmund Rich—Walter and Thomas de Cantilupe — Other great Churchmen — Constitutions of Otho and Ottoboni.

It was a strange complication of circumstances which led to that turn of the tide which was briefly noticed at the close of the last chapter. The commencement of the revolt of England against Rome may be clearly traced to a Primate who was already a Cardinal, and who was a nominee of the Pope, but who not only showed himself a true patriot, but also, without losing his own respect for the Papal authority, did more indirectly to discredit that authority in England than any other man. More-

over, the same man was the cause or occasion alike of John's humiliation before the Pope and of his subsequent close alliance with the Pope. Details will explain these apparent paradoxes.

The English Church seemed to have suffered an irreparable loss through the death of Hubert Walter, Archbishop of Canterbury in 1205, for he was apparently the only man who could support the cause of the Church against an ungodly and tyrannical King; but, as a matter of fact, his death was a gain, for he made way for a far stronger and more effective champion of the Church than himself. Some of the younger monks of Christ Church, Canterbury, had the audacity to elect their Sub-prior, Reginald, to the vacant post, while the cathedral chapter, under the influence of the King, elected John de Gray, Bishop of Norwich. Both parties appealed to Rome, and both elections were quashed in December, 1206. Sixteen monks were sent to represent the whole chapter, ostensibly with full power to elect whom they would; but it came out that they had secret instructions to elect John de Gray, a manœuvre which was very characteristic of the double-dealing of King John. It hardly required the Pope's guidance to show the electors that there was a native Englishman present in the council (being a Cardinal) whose claims were immeasurably superior to those of either Reginald or John de Gray.[1] That man was Stephen Langton, who was elected accord-

[1] For a fuller account of what may be called the 'triangular duel' as to the selection of a successor to Hubert Walter, see Bishop Stubbs' 'Early Plantagenets,' pp. 137-141, where the whole complicated dispute is described most luminously and exhaustively.

ingly. King John had sought to entrap others, and was entrapped himself. He had promised to support anyone chosen by the sixteen delegates, thinking that he had made it secure that they would choose John de Gray. When, therefore, the Pope wrote to inform him that the choice had fallen upon Stephen, and claimed the fulfilment of his promise, he was violently enraged. He denounced as a public enemy anyone who should receive the new Archbishop, and expelled the Canterbury monks. Stephen, however, had been consecrated by Pope Innocent himself, at Viterbo, June 17, 1207, and Pope Innocent was the last person in the world to yield to a man like John. As we have seen, he threatened to place the kingdom under an interdict, and, when the King still remained obstinate, put the threat into execution. Stephen, however, was not allowed to enter the kingdom, and after two years the excommunication of the King followed; then came the King's abject submission, his formal delivery of his kingdom to the Papal Legate, and his receiving it back again as a fief of the Pope.[1] It was not so much the thing itself as the manner of doing it, and the after-conduct both of the King and of the Pope and of the successors of both, that caused and kept up the reaction against Rome. In those feudal times it would not seem so degrading a thing as it seems to us, even for a King of England to do homage for his kingdom to the Pope as suzerain; it was a formal act, not necessarily implying any great subserviency. William I. did not think himself degraded by doing homage to the King of France for Normandy; nor

[1] 'De libero fecit se servum, et de dominante servientem,' writes Matthew Paris indignantly ('Historia Major,' p. 658).

Henry II. for his far wider possessions in France. But the whole relationship between the Crown and the Papacy at this period was so aggravating to Englishmen that the act of homage left a sting behind it which was never removed. The contrast between the conduct of King John and of Archbishop Stephen was most glaring; there was meanness, shuffling, want of all patriotism and of all principle, on the one side; nobleness, straightforwardness, high principle, on the other. And Rome deliberately allied itself with the bad against the good, with the oppressor against the asserter of the liberty of the Church, with the rebellious against the faithful son of the Apostolical See itself. It is true that John put on a thin veneer of goodness, posed as a champion of Christendom, and vapoured about taking the Cross; but he only made matters worse by adding hypocrisy to his other sins. People could not for a moment believe that Innocent III. really accepted him in his new character of penitent and saint. Their moral sense was shocked at the head of Western Christendom taking under his wing a man of gross profligacy, abominable cruelty, a bad son, a bad husband, a bad brother, and more than suspected of being the murderer of his own nephew; while he suspended the blameless Archbishop, who had been nominated by himself, and was devoted both to the doctrine and the discipline of the Church. It was, again, most offensive to England that Rome should be opposed to the Great Charter, which was the work of Archbishop Stephen more than of any other man. What was that charter but a confirmation of the charter of Henry I., and of the good laws of King Edward the Confessor?

What was there in it which was in the least opposed, nay, which was not conducive to, the interests of that religion of which Rome professed to be the centre? It defended the Church from royal tyranny: 'We have granted to God and by this present charter have confirmed that the Church of England should be free, and should have all its rights untouched, and its liberties unharmed.' Thus at the outset it confirmed generally the liberties of the Church. Then in detail it secured to the clergy freedom of elections, superseding the necessity of a royal *congé d'elire* and confirmation; it provided that the fines imposed on the clergy for any offence were to be proportional to their lay estates, not to their ecclesiastical benefices; and it virtually removed all check upon appeals to Rome, by allowing every man to depart from the kingdom at pleasure. According to the ideas of the time, all these provisions would be *for*, not *against*, the Church; and yet the head of the Church set his face against them—at least, against their authors! If Innocent called *his* a 'holy war,' with much more reason might Langton; and, accordingly, the confederacy of the barons under his guidance was termed 'the army of God and of the Holy Church.'

At the same time this unholy and unnatural alliance between Pope and King, which was continued by the successors both of Innocent and John, was a very formidable one, and enabled the Pope to venture upon making exactions which he had never dreamed of making before. In the early days of Henry III. a Papal Legate was always in residence at the English Court, to represent the overlord of England, and in that capacity to interfere in all the

business of Church and State. Through the efforts of Langton the Legate was withdrawn for a while, but he returned again in the primacy of Edmund Rich. Indeed, Henry had himself privately requested the visit of a Papal Nuncio. Cardinal Otho was sent accordingly, and, on his landing in England, in June, 1227, the King met him in person, bowed the knee before him, and reverently escorted him. The Cardinal soon acquired unbounded influence over the weak but devout King. He did not abuse his power; on the contrary, the Constitutions he framed for the English Church were sensible and temperate, striving, but in vain, to put a stop to some of the most glaring abuses of the day. In 1228 the great Archbishop Stephen died, to the intense relief of the Pope, whose hand was more and more heavy upon the English Church and nation. He demanded no less than a tenth from the whole realm; but this was going rather too far, and the barons successfully resisted the demand. The right of presentation to benefices was openly sold in the Papal market, and Italian clergy were forced upon some of the best livings in England; the young King was as un-English in his dealings with the Church as with the State; in fact, there were precisely the same combinations as there were in the days of his father, the King and the Pope being on one side, the Church and the barons on the other.[1]

[1] Dr. Lingard, though a Roman Catholic, admits, with his usual fairness, that 'the history of Henry's transactions with the Court of Rome discloses to us a long course of oppression, under which the English clergy, by the united influence of the crown and the tiara, were compelled to submit to the most grievous exactions' ('History of England,' vol. ii., ch. vi, p. 205).

But just in proportion to the increased sway which Rome exercised over England under Innocent III. and his successor, was its loss of real respect and reverence in the island Church. Mutterings of the approaching storm which burst forth under Wiclif and the Lollards might be heard with increasing loudness from the early days of the thirteenth century onwards. There was no attack as yet upon the authority of Rome, but only on her glaring abuse of that authority. This point is strikingly illustrated in the history of one who may be called a reformer before the Reformation, but who at the same time never swerved in his deference to the Papal See as the head of Western Christendom.

This was Robert Grosseteste (1175-1253), Bishop of Lincoln, and certainly after Stephen Langton the foremost English prelate in the thirteenth century. Grosseteste had achieved a unique reputation for learning and piety at Oxford and elsewhere, when in 1235 he was elected to the bishopric of Lincoln. His predecessor, Hugh de Wells, had made laudable efforts to reform his unwieldy diocese, in which he received valuable aid from Grosseteste, then Archdeacon of Leicester. Grosseteste, having now the reins in his own hands, prosecuted the work of reform with unsparing vigour, and in so doing was brought into frequent collision with Rome. But he still accepted the Pope as a final authority, and in his long dispute with the Lincoln chapter as to his right to visit the cathedral as well as the rest of his diocese, he agreed to abide by the Papal decision, which after six years was given in his favour in 1245; but when he felt himself manifestly in the

right, he had no scruple about defying both Pope and King. He manfully resisted the appointment of one John Mansel to the prebend of Thame, which Henry III. had conferred upon Mansel by a Papal provision; and he carried his point. He was not so successful in his attempt to stop a gross practical abuse. He found that many parishes in his diocese were impoverished and left without resident ministers, because the monasteries had gained possession of their property. He determined to take the benefices into his own hands, and institute vicars. But some of the orders claimed exemption from episcopal jurisdiction, appealed to the Pope, and carried their case by a free use, it was said, of gold. He had no hesitation about preaching against the abuses of the Papal Court and the scandals that prevailed among the clergy. In 1250 he visited Pope Innocent IV. at Lyons, and presented to him a memorial in which he charged the evils of bad pastors upon the Roman Curia itself. In 1251 he flatly refused to admit to a rich benefice in his diocese an Italian who could not even speak English, and he was temporarily suspended by the Pope in consequence. In 1253 he had the moral courage to refuse to induct into a canonry of Lincoln the Pope's own nephew, Frederick of Lavagna, and the interesting letter in which he justified his refusal explains very clearly the consistency of his attitude towards Rome. He was a man of great and varied learning. 'The Bishop of Lincoln,' writes the famous philosopher, Friar Roger Bacon, who knew him well at Oxford, 'was the only man living who was in possession of all the sciences;' and so great was his influence upon Church life and thought that the first half of the thirteenth century

has been termed 'the age of Robert Grosseteste.'[1] 'Probably no one,' writes the accomplished editor in recent times of his 'Letters,' 'has had greater influence upon English thought and English literature for the two centuries which followed his age.'[2] After his death, in 1253, the people all regarded him as a saint; but it is not surprising, considering the line he so often took in regard both to Pope and King, that, though several attempts were made to procure his canonization, they all failed.

Bishop Grosseteste set an example of courage which was followed by other bishops. His friend Sewall de Bovill was promoted in 1256 from the deanery to the archbishopric of York, and the Pope took upon himself to appoint to the vacant deanery an Italian called Giordano, who could not speak English. The new Archbishop declared the appointment invalid, for which he was laid under an interdict. He refused to admit some more Italians into his diocese for preferment, and was excommunicated by Alexander IV. But though the sentence of excommunication was never removed, he still retained the sympathies of all his people—a remarkable instance of the changed feeling towards Rome. Sewall, like Grosseteste, was so far from denying the authority of the Apostolical See that he wrote a humble remonstrance to the Pope justifying his conduct on distinctly Roman principles. Very much the same line was taken by Richard, Bishop of Chichester, deservedly canonized as S. Richard, another friend

[1] See J. B. Mullinger's 'University of Cambridge,' vol. i., ch. i., p. 84.

[2] 'Roberti Grosseteste Epistolæ,' preface by Rev. H. R. Luard (Rolls Series).

of Grosseteste's, and also by William of Occam, the famous schoolman.

Indeed, resistance to Rome on what may be called Roman grounds was now of frequent occurrence. In 1256 the Pope pressed the English bishops for the monstrous grant of a tenth for three years as an aid to the Sicilian expedition; whereupon one Bishop (Fulk, of London) declared that he would sooner lose his hand, and another (Walter Cantilupe, of Winchester) that he would sooner be hanged; and in spite of the remonstrances of Henry III., who, as usual, sided with the Pope, the demand was successfully resisted. Traces of the same spirit of resistance may be found in the attitude of the National Church generally in regard to those long disputes between the King and his barons, which culminated in a civil war in 1263. Rome was, of course, on the side of the King, and so were many individual clergy; but the Church of England, as a body, was certainly on the side of the barons. In fact, it was regarded as a religious war. Led by a Crusader who was looked upon by his contemporaries as a saint, the insurgents took the white cross as their badge, and passed the night before their great victory at Lewes in the confession of their sins and in prayer, while the Royalists passed it in sacrilegious orgies. It was a repetition of the scene before the battle of Senlac, and issued in a similar result—for a time.[1] Simon

[1] Mr. Pearson ('History of England,' ii 245) compares the struggle to that between 'the Cavaliers and Puritans' in the seventeenth century; but the comparison will surely not hold good. It seems to me more nearly to resemble that between the English and the Normans in the eleventh century; but that, only in the details mentioned above.

de Montfort himself, the leader of the barons, was a man who took the deepest interest in religious matters, and his leanings were all in favour of the independence of the Church, and against its subjection to a foreign power.[1] He was the intimate personal friend of Grosseteste, and cordially sympathized with him in his attempts to reform the Church. When the barons were, in the first instance, successful, they refused to admit Guido, the Papal Legate, into England, and were excommunicated in consequence. Guido himself became Pope, and after the defeat of the barons he procured for another what he had not been able to gain for himself, viz., the admission into England of Ottoboni as Papal Legate; and Ottoboni suspended those bishops who had taken the part of the King's enemies. Thus, broadly speaking, it was the King and the Pope on one side, the Church and the barons on the other. It might, therefore, have been anticipated that the final victory of the King would have strengthened the Papal power in England, but it was not so. The national party, though defeated, had succeeded in producing an altered state of feeling, one result of which was the gradual ignoring of the suzerainty of Rome; and when the strong hand of Edward I. took the place of the weak hand of Henry III., England's vassalage soon became a thing of the past.

The waning power, however, of Rome in England was immensely, though not perhaps immediately, increased by the rise and wonderfully rapid growth

[1] Hence the Pope said, 'Nothing could be done unless that turbulent man of sin and all his race were plucked out of the realm'—and excommunicated him. See Milman's 'History of Latin Christianity,' book xi., ch. iii.

of the mendicant orders, which took place in the thirteenth century.[1] Some such movement was inevitable, according to the laws of Church life. The vast wealth which had been amassed by some of the monasteries, the sumptuous manner of life which was reported to be led in them, the secularization of the clergy, especially of the higher ranks, in whose hands the government of the country had practically been for many years, were sure to lead to a reaction in some shape or other. The shape it took was that of the mendicant orders, or begging friars, which, though not founded in England, very shortly found their way hither. First came the Dominicans, or Black Friars, about the year 1221; then the Franciscans, or Grey Friars, about 1224; then the Carmelites, or White Friars, who came over to England about 1240 or 1250; then the Augustines, or Austin Friars, about 1252, and other orders. The Franciscans were by far the most numerous and influential of all. One of their first settlements was at Oxford, where they were kindly received by the Dominicans, who were already settled there. The object which the friars had at heart was a very noble one. It was, in a word, to restore the spiritual life; and they thought, not without reason, that the great hindrance to its restoration was that worldly wealth which had been amassed by many who professed to be followers of Him who had not where to lay His head. They made it their rule neither to accept nor to own any

[1] In the reign of Henry III. there were 83 friaries founded, and 74 monasteries; in that of Edward I., 61 friaries and 16 monasteries; in that of Edward II., 20 friaries and 5 monasteries; in that of Edward III., 24 friaries and 7 monasteries; in that of Richard II., 4 friaries and 4 monasteries.

estate; they were to live, as their name implies, on the alms of the people for whose spiritual benefit they laboured. They were invested with extraordinary privileges by the Apostolical See, which was the only authority they recognised outside their own order. They might go whither they would; they might invade monasteries and parishes, taking upon themselves the duties of the abbots and priors in the former, and those of the parish priests in the latter; they might encourage all men to make their confessions to *them*, and to receive the Sacrament at *their* hands, for which purpose they carried about with them wooden tables and stone altars on which they might celebrate the Holy Mysteries. Such privileges were in the end subversive of all discipline and order in monasteries and parishes; but the evil results did not show themselves at first. While they still retained their first love, and were only anxious for the spiritual benefit of mankind, for which they sacrificed all that flesh holds dear, there is no doubt that they supplied, in however irregular a way, what was sorely lacking in the Church of England, as in other Churches of Christendom. Grosseteste, who had known both the chief orders well at Oxford, employed both Dominicans and Franciscans in his work of reform when he became a Bishop, and spoke most highly of their labours.[1]

[1] 'If your Holiness,' he writes to Gregory IX. in 1238, 'could see with what devotion and humility the people run to hear the Word of life from them, for confession and instruction as to daily life, and how much improvement the clergy and the regulars have obtained by imitating them, you would indeed say that they that dwelt in the shadow of death, upon them hath the light shined' (Luard's preface to Grosseteste's 'Epistolæ,'

One of the most curious paradoxes in the early history of the Franciscans is that, though their founder directly discouraged their pursuit of learning, telling them that their duty was to work, not to read, yet, as a matter of fact, they gave a greater impulse to learning than had ever been given—certainly since the times of Lanfranc and Anselm, one might almost say since the times of Bede and Alcuin. In no place were the Franciscans more influential than at Oxford. They were, if not the founders, at least the great supporters of the scholastic philosophy. That philosophy has now fallen into disrepute. One is apt to associate with 'the schoolmen' the ideas of profitless wranglings and hard, dry, hair-splitting speculations. But the schoolmen were the salt of the earth in their day, and, next to Paris, Oxford was their chosen home. Their great object, so far as religion was concerned, was surely a most desirable one. It was, speaking generally, to establish an alliance between faith and reason, or, in other words, 'to arrange the orthodox system of the Church, such as authority had made it, according to the rules and methods of the Aristotelian dialectics.'[1] The most distinguished men at Oxford were either friars or patrons of the friars. Among the latter must be ranked the most noted Churchman of his day, Robert Grosseteste. On, or soon after, the first settlement of the Franciscans at Oxford, he was persuaded by their leader and first Provincial Minister, Angnellus of Pisa, to act as their 'lector,' and he

---

p. xxii). See also Lechler, 'John Wiclif and his English Precursors,' vol. i., pp. 41, 42 (translation by Professor Lorimer).

[1] Hallam's 'Literature of Europe,' i. 13.

has been termed the first 'Master of the Minorites.' He continued his lectures until his appointment to the bishopric of Lincoln in 1235, when he ceased to reside at Oxford. This appointment did not, of course, sever his connection with the University, but, in one sense, rather strengthened it. For not only was Oxford in his diocese, but he was *ex-officio* head of the University, the Chancellor of the University being only his delegate. Neither did it lessen his interest in the Franciscans there; he was their trusted friend, and in 1253, 'because of his love for Friar Adam Marsh, left in his will all his books to the convent of Friars Minors at Oxford.'[1]

This introduces us to another great and good man among the Oxford Franciscans, Adam de Marisco, or 'Friar Adam Marsh,' the 'Doctor Illustris' of the schoolmen. His friendship with Grosseteste dates from his early years, when he studied under him at Oxford. He had a good chance of preferment in the Church, for he was nephew of the powerful Bishop of Durham, Richard Marsh, who showed every inclination to advance him. But at the persuasion of his friend and pupil, Adam of Oxford, also a Minorite,[2] he gave up 'all worldly greatness and a large income through zeal for greater poverty,' and entered the Franciscan order at Worcester. Then he returned to Oxford, and became lector to the Franciscans there. He rose to be one of the leading men of the day, and used all his

[1] For an exhaustive account of 'The Grey Friars in Oxford,' see Mr. A. G. Little's volume published by the Oxford Historical Society.

[2] The Franciscans called themselves Minorites because they were to be 'minores minimis.'

influence for good purposes, among other things persuading the King to cease from his cruel persecutions of the Jews. He was a warm friend and supporter of Simon de Montfort, but did not hesitate to tell him plainly of his faults of temper, and also to admonish Eleanor de Montfort, the patriot's wife and the King's sister, on her duties as a wife and mother, and on her too great fondness for dress. It is a real testimony to the good designs of the great Earl that Adam de Marisco described them as efforts 'to purge, illuminate, and sanctify the Church of God.' On his death, in 1258, he was buried at Lincoln close to his life-long friend, Grosseteste, who terms him 'a wise man and a prudent, and fervent for the salvation of souls.'

Among those who thoroughly appreciated Adam de Marisco was his pupil, Roger Bacon, the greatest of all the Franciscan friars in the thirteenth century, or, indeed, in any century. He, too, received his education at Oxford, and through the persuasion of Grosseteste entered the Franciscan order. Grosseteste himself and Adam de Marisco were enlightened enough to sympathize with his invaluable labours in the cause of science; but this was not the case generally, nor with his own order in particular. He tells us himself that 'a strict prohibition had been passed by his superiors to his writing on science, under penalty of forfeiture of the book and many days' fasting or bread and water, if any book written by us [the Franciscans] should be communicated to strangers.' He wrote under the greatest discouragement, his works being regarded 'with pious horror in the Middle Ages.' The most provoking of all the results of this foolish and ignorant prejudice was

that his writings were mutilated, and have only come down to us in a fragmentary state. And yet he was a most orthodox Christian. He held, indeed, that it was 'a mistake for mere boys to begin the study of theology before they had been grounded in philosophy'; but it was the recognition of this fact that led the Church of England at one time most wisely to insist upon a general education at the University for candidates for Holy Orders before they began the special study of theology. Both Franciscans and Dominicans did a noble work for the Church, which has been far too much ignored, in their early and palmy days.

Sore need was there for such work in the middle of the thirteenth century. Not in the days of the wicked King John, not in those of the godless Red King, did the Church suffer more severely than in the days of Henry III.—a man who had a real sense of religion, and was to some extent influenced by it. His propensity to flood his country with foreign relatives and favourites was in no department more glaring and baneful than in that of religion. The most notorious of those foreigners he found awaiting him as a sort of 'damnosa hæreditas' from his father. This was Peter des Roches, Bishop of Winchester, a Poictevin, who had stood by King John against Langton and the barons at Runnymead, who had been, with Pandulf, the Pope's mouthpiece in suspending Langton, and who at once took the lead of the foreign against the national party, when the young King succeeded. Other foreigners quickly flowed in from two distinct sources. The needy relatives of the Queen-mother had to be provided for as well as those of the King. So the Church

and country were despoiled both by the 'King's men,' the Poictevins, and the 'Queen's men,' the Savoyards. One or two glaring instances will illustrate this.

Aymer or Ethelmar de Valence was the King's half-brother, being the son of Isabella, wife of King John, by her second husband, Hugh, Count of La Marche. In 1247 he came over to England in needy circumstances, and, as he was in minor Orders, his brother was able to provide for him at the expense of the Church, which he did most liberally. Living upon living and pension upon pension, extracted from different bishops and abbots, were lavished upon this incompetent young man, until his income soon exceeded that of an Archbishop. In 1249 Henry strove to procure his election to the great bishopric of Durham; but this was too much: the chapter rejected him as too young and too ignorant for the office; and Henry had to be content with adding the rectory of Wearmouth to Aymer's many preferments. But in 1250 Winchester fell vacant, and this time the King was more successful. The chapter was forced to elect Aymer, though he was not even in deacon's Orders, being only an acolyte; though he could not speak one word of English; though he was still a mere youth, and had absolutely no qualifications to recommend him. He was not consecrated until 1260, but he received the temporalities of the see (the main thing to be desired), and exercised the temporal jurisdiction from the time of his election. It is a savage satisfaction to be able to add that the recipient of all these preferments did not show himself so subservient to his brother and patron as he was expected to be.

The case of Boniface of Savoy is even more outrageous. Boniface was uncle of Eleanor, wife of Henry III., and, like other needy Savoyards, looked to England to provide for him. He was not disdisappointed, for in 1241, three years before he even set foot in England, he was nominated by the King Archbishop of Canterbury. The monks of Christ Church were forced to elect him, and after some delays, owing to changes in the Papacy, the election was confirmed in 1243 by Pope Innocent IV. In 1244 the new Archbishop made his first appearance in England, where he was most kindly received, among others by Bishop Grosseteste, of all men in the world, who hoped that he might use his influence for good with his royal nephew. Boniface soon showed that he intended to be, at any rate, an *active* Archbishop. He would follow the excellent example of Grosseteste — with a difference. Grosseteste visited every part of his vast diocese with a view to establishing reforms; Boniface purposed to visit every part of his province, with a view to extracting money for himself. But his progress was not altogether smooth. He was violently resisted by the Dean and Chapter of S. Paul's; and at the priory of S. Bartholomew, in London, he was so provoked that he actually assaulted the Sub-prior, an aged man, with his fist. He seems to have been prepared for the riot which ensued, for it was found that he was encased in armour beneath his pontificals. Again one has a grim pleasure in recording that he was not so grateful to his nephew and patron as he might have been; he took the national side against Henry, and had a violent controversy with Aymer of Winchester.

Other samples might easily be given,[1] but it is a more grateful task to turn to the brighter side of the picture. In spite of the sinister influences at work in the reigns of John and Henry, which covered the greater part of the century (1200-1272), it has been asserted by an indisputable authority that 'the thirteenth century was the golden age of English Churchmanship.'[2] Nor is it difficult to account for this. Just as the first ages of Christianity were the purest, because the fires of persecution were purifying as well as persecuting fires, so the very evils which existed in the thirteenth century drew out the faith, courage, and self-denial of true Churchmen. The share which ecclesiastics took in reforming both the Church and nation was far larger than that of the laity. Again to quote Bishop Stubbs: 'The age that produced one Simon produced among the bishops Stephen Langton, S. Edmund, Grosseteste, and the Cantilupes.' Of two out of the five enough has been said, but a word must be added respecting the other three.

It is a curious fact that, though the English Church very naturally rebelled against the claim of the Pope to nominate her primates, yet she owes three of the very best of them, before the Reformation, to the Papal nomination. We have already seen how Theodore of Tarsus and Stephen Langton were

[1] The preferments lavished upon foreigners embraced the lower as well as the higher posts in the Church. Perhaps the climax of outrage to men's feelings was reached when the King's jester was rewarded with a benefice. He was a foreigner, of course, a Poictevin by birth, and it did not mend matters, but rather aggravated the insult, that he was chaplain to Henry's half-brother, Geoffrey of Lusignan.

[2] Bishop Stubbs, 'Const. Hist.,' vol. ii., ch. xv., p. 313.

simply nominees of the Pope; and the same may be said of a third, who was one of the saintliest characters of the Middle Ages. It was at the instance of Pope Gregory IX. that Edmund Rich was elected to the archbishopric of Canterbury in 1234. The whole tenor of his life shows that it was no feigned reluctance which made him shrink from accepting this lofty post, which he reached *per saltum*. He was born at Abingdon, where he passed his early life. Like so many saints, he owed his religious impressions to his mother; but, unlike many, he never seems to have gone astray from his early training. He was first a student, and then a teacher at the two most famous Universities of the day, Paris and Oxford. He at first used to lecture on secular subjects, but was led by a dream[1]—his life is full of dreams, and visions, and supernatural occurrences—to devote himself entirely to theology, of which he became a master; and he 'spent many years in expounding the Lord's Law.' We next find him Treasurer of Salisbury Cathedral, under Bishop Poor, its builder. There he is said to have been so lavish in his liberality to the poor that his income was always exhausted at the end of half the year, and he used to spend the other half with his friend,

[1] 'In one of his dreamy moments he seemed to see his mother standing before him. Pointing, with her usual stern look, to the mathematical diagrams by which he was surrounded, she demanded what those figures were, in the contemplation of which her son was absorbed. She then seemed to take his right hand, and thereon described three circles, on each of which she marked the name of one of the Persons of the Blessed Trinity, and having said, "Henceforth, my son, be these thy diagrams," she vanished.'—Hook's 'Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury,' iii. 144.

Stephen of Lexington, the Abbot of Stanley, in Wiltshire. His austerities from his boyhood (for he was taught to practise them by his mother) were most strict and painful. He became famous as a preacher, and at the Pope's command he preached the Crusade of 1227 in the Western counties.[1] In the spring of 1234 he was consecrated to the primacy without passing through any intervening dignities. Like many humble-minded men, he showed himself most courageous, rebuking the King without any scruple; and for a while Henry seemed inclined to be guided by his counsels. But he identified himself too much with the national party to please the King for long. He had not, however, the spirit of Stephen Langton; he was a saint rather than a hero; and, at last, despairing of the republic, he retired to the congenial air of a monastery, finding a refuge where his great predecessors, Becket and Langton, had found one, among the Cistercians at Pontigny, in 1240. He died at Soissy, near Pontigny, in the November of the same year, and after a long delay was canonized. The miracles said to have been wrought at his tomb almost rivalled those wrought at the shrine of S. Thomas himself.

The two Cantilupes, uncle and nephew, were rather more of the earth earthy than the saintly Edmund Rich; but perhaps for that very reason they were better fitted to grapple with difficulties; and their high social position and family influence helped them in fighting the battle of the Church. Walter de Cantilupe, son of the first Baron Cantilupe, was elected Bishop of Worcester in 1236, and was a most

[1] Gloucestershire, Worcestershire, Oxfordshire, and Berkshire, are mentioned as the scenes of his labours. See Hook, iii. 148.

vigorous administrator of his diocese, as may be seen from his Constitutions, issued in 1240. He was a staunch supporter of the national party, working shoulder to shoulder with Bishop Grosseteste until the death of the latter in 1253, and not relaxing his efforts when he was deprived of the support of that great man. So high was his reputation for sanctity, that even a chronicler who took the King's side[1] against the barons admits that 'he would have deserved canonization had it not been for his adherence to Simon de Montfort.'

Thomas de Cantilupe was son of the second Baron Cantilupe, and therefore nephew of Walter, from whom he received much of his early training. He studied both at Paris and Oxford; then taught canon law at Oxford, and was elected Chancellor of the University in 1262. Like his uncle, he attached himself firmly to the popular side, and became an intimate friend of Simon de Montfort. After the victory of the barons at Lewes, he was appointed Chancellor of England, and succeeded in pleasing the King as well as the barons. But after the battle of Evesham he retired from political life, and devoted himself exclusively to theology, lecturing first at Paris and then at Oxford, of which University he was again appointed Chancellor. Like too many of his day, he was a pluralist; but he was very conscientious in procuring good vicars to act for him, and he also visited regularly all his cures himself. In 1275 he was elected Bishop of Hereford, and showed himself a most active Bishop in his border diocese. In 1320, many years after his death, he was canonized, and there is a special interest in the fact,

[1] Thomas Wykes.

because he was the last Englishman who received the title of saint.

Among other eminent Churchmen of the period were William Button or Bitton, the second of that name who held the bishopric of Bath and Wells (1266), a veritable saint, though never canonized; Richard Poor, the munificent Bishop of Salisbury, to whom we are indebted for the most uniform of all our cathedrals; Walter Gray, whom the historian of the Archbishops of York calls, with a little pardonable exaggeration in favour of a brother Yorkshireman, 'the greatest prelate of the century in which he lived'[1]; Walter Giffard, another Archbishop of York; Richard Wych, Bishop of Chichester, who has a place in the English calendar. But as this is not a biographical dictionary, it must suffice to mention their names (to which others of almost equal eminence might be added), and pass on from individuals to the general history of the Church, which is of special interest and importance during the reign of the Edwards.

One incident, however, deeply affecting the interests of the Church, which took place in the latter part of Henry III.'s reign (1268) must be noted. This was the famous meeting at S. Paul's Cathedral, to which the Papal Legate, Cardinal Ottoboni, summoned 'all the prelates and dignitaries of the first and second orders throughout the realm,'

[1] Dixon's 'Fasti Eboracenses,' ed. Raine, p. 290. Bishop Stubbs, a quite unbiased authority, writing of Archbishop Stephen Langton, says: 'He had in Walter Gray, now [1216], and for nearly forty years after, Archbishop of York, an experienced colleague in the government of the Church, and a helper of great official knowledge, honesty, and ability' (Const. Hist., vol. ii., ch. xiv., p. 29).

and promulgated what were known as the 'Constitutions of Ottoboni.' These, which were a confirmation and enlargement of the Constitutions of Cardinal Otho, promulgated forty years earlier, 'became,' says Dean Milman, 'the code of ecclesiastical law in England for several centuries down to the Reformation.'[1]

[1] 'Annals of S. Paul's,' ch. iii., p. 54. For a summary of these statutes, see Milman's 'Latin Christianity,' vol. vi., p. 381. See also Dr. Lingard's 'History of England,' ii. 234, and Bishop Stubbs' 'Lectures on Mediæval and Modern History,' lecture xiii., p. 308.

CHAPTER IX.

THE MEDIÆVAL CHURCH.

From the Accession of Edward I. to the Death of Wiclif (1272-1384).

Reign of Edward I. an important era—At first King on good terms with clergy—Object of Welsh and Scotch wars—The three estates of the realm—Convocations not due to legislation of Edward—*Præmunientes* clause—Dispute between King and clergy about subsidies—Statute of Mortmain—*Circumspecte Agatis*—Statute of Carlisle—Character of Edward I.—Robert Burnell, Chancellor—Misrule of Edward II.—Some great Churchmen in his reign—Suppression of Knights Templars—Edward III.—Statute of Provisors—Statute of *Præmunire*—Clergy ground down by regal and Papal exactions—King refused to pay tribute to Pope—Thomas Bradwardine—John Wiclif—Early history—Public life: (1) the scholastic period; (2) the political period; (3) the theological period—*Speeches of Seven Temporal Lords*—Mission to Bruges—'De Juramento Annaldi'—Rector of Lutterworth—Trial before Convocation of Canterbury—Alliance with John of Gaunt—Nineteen propositions of Wiclif sent to Pope—Five Bulls issued against him—Cited before Pope's commissioners—Effects of Papal schism on Wiclif and on the Church—Wiclif puts forth twelve theses against Transubstantiation—Pronounced erroneous and heretical at Oxford—War with mendicant friars—Blamed for revolt of peasants—His 'poor priests'—Conflict with Archbishop Courtenay—The 'Earthquake Council'—Letters patent against itinerant preachers—Wiclif's translations of the Bible—William of Wykeham—Foundation of his two colleges—Bishop Spencer of Norwich and the Papal Crusade—Wiclif's 'Cruciata.'

So far as constitutional history is concerned, the period we have now reached is perhaps the most im-

portant of all periods. For it was in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries that the constitution of the Church, as a National Church, was settled. In the early part of the thirteenth century England became one united nation; in the early part of the fourteenth her Constitution was virtually established on its present lines, and of that Constitution the National Church was an essential part.

The process was accelerated by the fact that, in 1272, a born lawyer as well as a born soldier ascended the throne, and, by his clear head no less than by his strong arm, helped materially to put things ecclesiastical, as well as things civil, into shape during the thirty-five years of his most important reign.

After the accession of Edward I., we hear little more of the feudal subjection of England to Rome, partly, perhaps, because the feudal system itself was dying out, but chiefly because there was at last a really strong man holding the reins, who was not the man to do feudal homage to any foreign potentate. The *spiritual* authority of the Apostolical See he was ready enough to acknowledge, and 'in the early part of his reign he was on the best terms with the clergy; he respected them, and they respected him.'[1] As a dutiful son of the Church, he was quite prepared to undertake Crusades, to discountenance—not to say persecute—Jews, infidels, and heretics, and to recognise the clergy as the first estate of the realm. But, as King of England—or, rather, as King of Great Britain, for this was what he aimed at in his pertinacious struggles with Wales and Scotland, in

[1] Milman's 'Latin Christianity,' book xi., ch. viii.

which he was warmly supported by the hierarchy[1]—he could brook no interference whatever outside his own four sees. The arrangement of ecclesiastical affairs *within* those four sees, apart from the disturbing element of Rome, was difficult enough: for the constitution of the Church in its relation to the State had never yet been properly defined. William the Conqueror and Lanfranc had upset the old arrangement which had worked so happily in the simple, early English times, but had put nothing definite in its place. Hence the perpetual struggle between Crown and Mitre, first between William II. and Anselm, then between Henry I. and Anselm, then between Henry II. and Becket, then between John and Langton, then between Henry III. and the prelates who joined with the barons. But after the days of Edward I., down to the Reformation, we hear no more of what may be called constitutional struggles between Church and State, though the settlement was not arrived at without a long and severe struggle, which lasted during the whole reign of the great King.

'The thirteenth century,' writes Bishop Stubbs, 'turns the feudal council into an assembly of estates.'[2] Of these, the spiritual estate was the first; and by the spiritual estate was meant the whole body of the clergy. These, of course, could only make their wishes known through members of their own body delegated to speak in their name. And this brings us to the important question of representative government.

[1] 'Archbishop Peckham accompanied him to Wales, and pronounced excommunication against the rebellious princes.'—Milman's 'Latin Christianity,' book xi., ch. viii.

[2] 'Const. Hist.,' vol. ii, ch. xv., p. 177.

The question here concerns us only so far as it is connected with the National Church; but it is necessary, even in a brief sketch like the present, to enter into some detail as to what was done, and also as to what was not done. The matter has sometimes been so represented as to lead to the conclusion that we owe our Convocations as they now exist to the legislation of Edward I. and his very able Chancellor, Robert Burnell. But such a conclusion rests upon the assumptions that Convocations are something radically different from provincial synods; that they were called into existence to do things which are not within the competency of a synod; that they always required the royal authority for acting; and that the representation of the clergy in Convocation arose out of the non-synodical acts which Convocation was called to do—in fact, that Convocation grew out of the Parliamentary scheme for taxation by representation.

Now, to every one of these assumptions the Churchman demurs. He maintains that Convocations and provincial synods are identical; that they were designated by the same name, transacted the same business, were composed of the same elements, and were called by the same authority; and that the connection of Convocation with the royal writ was an accidental, not an essential, part of its constitution. He points to the undoubted fact that Archbishop Kilwardby, in 1277—that is, eighteen years before the supposed origin of the assemblies—summoned a Convocation, complete in all its parts, not by royal, but by his own authority; and that, in

[1] For a far more exhaustive account, see Bishop Stubbs' admirable chapters ('Const. Hist.,' vol. ii., chs. xiv., xv.).

fact, in all ages metropolitans had summoned synods of their provinces at their own discretion and under their own authority. He maintains against Romanists, on the one hand, and Erastians on the other—whose agreement on this point is a curious instance of extremes meeting—that the second order of the clergy were always constituent parts of such assemblies, and therefore that their admission into them was in no way connected with the financial measures of Edward I.; and that when presbyters were represented in no other way, they were certainly represented by the archdeacons. He points to two distinct instances in 1257 and 1258, long before the measures of Edward I. were thought of, in which the clergy were to give letters to the archdeacons, empowering them to act on their behalf. He can quote the actual words of Archbishop Kilwardby's summons to his suffragans, in 1277, 'ut nobiscum in propriis personis conveniant, unà cum aliquibus Personis Majoribus de suis capitulis et locorum Archidiaconis et Procuratoribus totius cleri Diœcesium singularum'; and the canon enacted in 1279 for 'the alteration of the numbers of the representatives of the clergy,' which clearly implies that there had been representatives of them before.

How, then, came it about that Edward I. has been regarded as the originator of our Convocations? In this way. The King was sorely pressed for money to carry on his various wars, and he thought—quite rightly—that the clergy should bear their fair share of the expense with the rest of the community. Nor do the clergy appear to have denied their obligation to do so; but they objected to the manner in which it was to be done. They had always had the privilege

of taxing themselves in their own proper assemblies. But in 1295 the King summoned the clergy to attend his secular Parliament by the famous *Præmunientes* clause (so called from the first word in it), his sole object being to raise the more easily money from them. The summons in the *Præmunientes* clause corresponds with the summons of the clergy to Convocation; and as the practice for the Sovereign to issue a royal writ directing the archbishops to summon their provincial synods was undoubtedly established in the time of Edward I., it is, perhaps, not wonderful that the two things—the summons to Parliament and the summons to synod—should have become confounded. But they were, in reality, entirely different. As Bishop Stubbs puts it, 'the two representative bodies, Convocation and the Parliamentary representation, of the clergy, are kept clearly distinct. The Convocations are two provincial councils meeting in their respective provinces; the Parliamentary representatives are one element of the general Parliament, and meet in the same place. Convocations are *two spiritual* assemblies; the Parliamentary assembly of the clergy is *one temporal* representation of the spiritual estate.'[1]

The writ of 1295 was but grudgingly obeyed, and a similar writ in 1296 led to an open rupture between the King and clergy. The Pope, Boniface VIII., issued his Bull *Clericis Laicos*, forbidding the clergy to tax the revenues of churches without his permission. Archbishop Winchelsey led the clergy to obey the Bull and refuse the King a subsidy. But at last matters were settled by a compromise, not, however,

[1] 'Const. Hist.,' ii., ch. xiv., p. 210.

till they had gone to such lengths that the whole body of the clergy had been practically outlawed, the King declaring that if they would not help the Government, the Government would not protect them. It was agreed that the clergy should vote their supplies in their own proper assemblies—a privilege which they retained for nearly four hundred years—but that they should recognise the duty of bearing their full share of the national burdens without leave granted by any foreign authority. Other steps had been taken previously in the same direction of national independence.

In 1279 the King submitted to the consideration of his Parliament a statute about which he had been meditating for some years, called technically *De viris religiosis*, but popularly the Statute of Mortmain. It provided that 'no religious person or any other whatsoever should presume to buy or sell any lands or tenements, or under pretence of donation or grant, or any other title whatsoever, to receive such from anyone, or by any method, art, or skill to appropriate them in such a way as whereby such lands and tenements should devolve in any manner to the dead hand.' Religious bodies were incapable of performing the services incident to the tenure of land in feudal times. Land, therefore, so held was said to be held in the dead hand. The statute was very necessary, for not only was a vast amount of land held by the Church, but also people were apt to have estates fraudulently conveyed to ecclesiastical bodies in order that they might escape the burdens entailed on them—in plain words, that they might cheat the superior lord, and ultimately the King and the nation. It was really no disadvantage

to the Church, which was too wealthy. At the same time, it should be remembered that the wealth of the Church was used for civil purposes. Ecclesiastics held almost all the high civil offices of State, and were paid for their services by the revenues they held as Churchmen, not by any salary. The statute, though it chiefly affected the Church, as a matter of fact, applied to all corporate bodies, as the words 'no religious person, *or any other whatsoever*,' imply. Corporate bodies cannot die, and it was partly in order to remedy the consequent loss to the feudal lord of all those feudal profits which accrued to him on the death of an individual proprietor that the Mortmain Act was passed. In 1285 was passed the important measure called *Circumspecte Agatis*, which defined the sphere of the jurisdiction of the ecclesiastical courts (an old matter of dispute), recognising their right to hold pleas on matters purely spiritual. In 1289 the King and Parliament indignantly refused the tribute which King John had stipulated to pay to the Pope; and in 1296 another anti-Papal measure was taken in opposition to the Bull of Pope Boniface VIII., *Clericis Laicos*, already described.

It hardly falls within the province of the Church historian to dwell on the great King's successful resistance to the Pope's claim on Scotland as a Papal fief; but one last statute, passed in a Parliament held at Carlisle in 1307, a little before Edward's death, must be noticed. This was called the *Statute of Carlisle;* it forbade the payment of tallages on monastic property and other imports by which money was raised to be sent out of the country.[1] As there were numerous alien priories which were

[1] Stubbs, 'Const. Hist.,' vol. ii., ch. xiv., p. 163.

constantly sending money to foreign monasteries, this was a statute fraught with important consequences.

It will have been seen that there was a dark as well as a bright side to Edward's character and conduct. He was essentially a strong man, and in the main a just one; he was also thoroughly English in all his views; and in all these points he presents a marked contrast both to his predecessors and his successor. But he was certainly at times cruel and tyrannical, and in his relation to the Church he was very arbitrary, and not always consistent; he was drawn one way by his patriotism, and another by his real respect for the authority of the Apostolic See, and these conflicting tendencies sometimes render it difficult to see on what principles he was acting; but he was a great King—perhaps the greatest who ever reigned—and the National Church has, on the whole, reason to respect his memory.

In attributing the settlement of the constitution in Church and State mainly to the lawyer-like mind and resolute will of Edward I., it would be unjust to forget the invaluable aid he received (and thoroughly appreciated) from his intimate friend and Chancellor, Robert Burnell, Bishop of Bath and Wells, whom he in vain attempted to raise to the primacy. Bishop Burnell was one of the greatest ecclesiastical statesmen that this country ever produced. The change which took place after his death in 1292 is of itself sufficient to show how large a share the Chancellor had in the important measures which marked the earlier part of Edward's reign; but the value which Edward set on Bishop Burnell's services is only another proof of the greatness of the greatest of the Plantagenet kings.

It was fortunate that so firm a foundation of the constitution of our National Church was laid under the rule of Edward I., for under the miserable *mis*-rule of his unworthy son nothing could have been done. In fact, during those deplorable twenty years (1307-1327) Church history is almost a blank; the standard of clerical efficiency became lower and lower, and the Church suffered grievously from the anarchy which prevailed. There were still, of course, good men, as there have been in the worst ages of the Church. Among them was John Dalderby, Bishop of Lincoln from 1300 to 1320, who was held in so high esteem for sanctity and learning that after his death a petition for his canonization was sent to the Pope by ten English bishops; but the English Church was in too bad odour at Rome for the petition to be granted. William Greenfield was a more than respectable Archbishop of York from 1304 to 1315, though, like many of the prelates of the period, he was more of a statesman than a divine; and his successor (1317-1340), William de Milton, bore an equally good character. A man of greater mark than either was Richard de Bury, a thorough book-worm, and a great encourager of learning, if not a really learned man himself, who held the prince-bishopric of Durham, and was a good administrator and a pious man. But these and a few others were exceptional cases, and it is to be feared that the general tone of the Church was low.

Almost the only active measure that appears to have been taken[1] was one of great injustice. This

[1] Except a statute of 1315, 'concerning divers liberties granted to the clergy,' which declared that 'neither the Pope nor any foreign council had a right to make canons for the English

was the suppression of the Knights Templars, which actually took place in 1312, though the attack upon them began earlier in the time of Edward I. Whatever we may think of the pilgrimages to the Holy Sepulchre, it was at any rate a noble project, worthy of Christian knights, to protect the poor pilgrims who were at least actuated by pious, if mistaken, motives; and this task the Templars performed. With the loss of all Christian territory in Palestine the occupation of the Red Cross Knights was gone. But they had amassed great wealth, and Edward I. was sorely in need of money for his various wars. The temptation to seize upon the treasures in the Templars' house in London was too great to be resisted; and yet the Templars, in a temper befitting Christian soldiers, in spite of the spoliation fought gallantly for their ungrateful country at Falkirk. But this availed them not. Crimes were laid to their charge of the most revolting and extravagant nature, but were never satisfactorily proved; confessions were wrung from them by torture; in 1308 the royal officers seized most of their property in England; and at last, in 1312, the order was dissolved in consequence of a Bull called *Faciens misericordiam*, sent by the Pope to Archbishop Winchelsey.[1] It is a slight satisfaction to be able to add that the order was carried out with less cruelty in England than it

Church.' This confirmed the previous rights of Convocation, but did not, as has been sometimes represented, establish any new right for that ancient synod of the Church.

[1] There were twenty-three preceptories in England. They were at first seized by the King and his nobles, but afterwards, by a Papal Bull and an Act of Parliament, transferred to the order of the Hospitallers, who were subsequently obliged to resign the greater part of them (Dixon, i. 321, 322).

was in France. The Templars, when they lost their preceptories, were allowed to reside in other religious houses, and in 1319 the Pope made an order that any Templar, if he chose, might take the vows required by the monastery in which he was residing.

The perpetual wars in which Edward III. was engaged during the greater part of his long reign (1327-1377) were not much more conducive to the welfare of the Church than were the civil disputes which went on during the disastrous reign of his father. Military glory has always been so dear to Englishmen that the third Edward's brilliant successes in France have thrown a glamour over his name, and rendered it more illustrious than that of his grandfather. But there is really no comparison between the two men. At the same time, the National Church owes a deep debt of gratitude to the memory of the third Edward; for he thoroughly identified himself with the Church's nationality, and several most important measures, leading to the restoration of her ancient independence, date from this period. One great step in this direction is directly traceable to the French war, which engrossed so much of the King's attention, and of the resources of the nation. The English had long chafed against the interference of the Roman Curia in their domestic affairs, and against the payment of the vast sums of money of which England was drained to enrich the Papal coffers. But the aggravation was increased tenfold when the Pope was virtually a Frenchman, residing at Avignon, with all his sympathies on the side of those with whom the English were at internecine war. The National Church was actually supplying the sinews of war to

the national enemy; and if the Pope pushed much further his system of 'reservations' and 'provisions,' by which a vacant bishopric or benefice was 'reserved' or 'provided for' by the Pope himself,[1] the Church would soon be in danger of being flooded by prelates and incumbents whose interests were French, not English. Matters reached a climax when English gold, wrung from the English Church, was actually used for redeeming French prisoners who had been taken in the war between England and France.

These anomalies led to the two most important anti-Papal measures which were passed before the time of Henry VIII. In the Parliament of April, 1342, both Lords and Commons petitioned against 'the Papal usurpation of appointing to benefices by provision'; in September, 1342, Edward wrote to the Pope complaining that by his system of reservations and provisions 'the revenues of the Church were given to foreigners, the rights of patrons defeated, and the authority of the royal courts diminished.' This produced no effect; and on January 30, 1344, he ordered that all persons bringing Bulls of provision should be arrested. But this, too, was unavailing; and at last, in the February Parliament of 1351, the famous *Statute of Provisors* was passed. The preamble of the statute was significant. It declared that 'the Holy Church of England was founded in the estate of prelacy within the realm of England, by the King and his progenitors, and

[1] Mr. Moberly well describes the grievance as 'the forced intrusion of foreign clerks into benefices, by means of what were called *provisions*—that is, writs prohibiting the exercise of his rights by an English patron, until some favourite, or favourites, of the Roman Court had been provided with benefices' ('Life of William of Wykeham,' p. 33).

by the earls, barons, and other nobles of the realm, and their ancestors, to inform them and the people of the law of God,' etc. The statute affirmed that 'the Bishop of Rome accroaching to him the seignories of such possessions and benefices, doth give to aliens who never dwell in England and to cardinals who might not dwell here, and to others as well aliens as denizens, as if he had been patron or advowse of the said dignities and benefices, as he was *not* of right of the law of England; whereby, if they should be suffered, there should scarcely be any benefice within a short time in the said realm, but that it should be in the hands of aliens and denizens by virtue of such provisions, against the good will and disposition of the founders of the benefices.' Therefore the statute enacts that 'any provisors or a person accepting a provision of the Pope and disturbing the right of a patron by the said provision, or their proctors, executors, and notaries,' were to be 'imprisoned, and not to be released until they had paid a fine and had given security that they would not transgress again, or sue for redress in any foreign Court.' The Papal encroachments which the statute was passed to restrain were described as tending to the 'annullation of the estate of the Holy Church of England.' The ostensible reason for introducing this system of provisions was to prevent patrons from keeping benefices long vacant, and converting the revenues to their private use. Therefore, lest the Statute of Provisors should revive this abuse, it was decreed that a benefice should lapse to the Bishop if the patron, on its vacancy, did not present within six months, and to the King if the Bishop did not present within one month.

It must frankly be owned that this Statute of Provisors, which had, as we shall see, to be frequently re-enacted, did not altogether work well at first. Popes, though they had been far too fond of appointing foreigners to valuable benefices in England, which was a real grievance to the English Church and nation, had yet, when it was a question between Englishman and Englishman, generally shown appreciation of merit of some kind; their very position, as outsiders, did not expose them to the temptations to nepotism to which, it is to be feared, English patrons, after the passing of the Act, or, rather, Acts, frequently yielded. It was complained that the latter showed an indifference to learning, in ignoring graduates of Oxford and Cambridge, and nominating uneducated men to valuable benefices. In 1399 both Universities sent petitions to Convocation against the abuse, as detrimental to learning; and in 1400 the House of Commons made a like petition to the King.[1] It was a real abuse, but *abusus non tollit usum;* and English Churchmen must still contend that the principle of the measure was right.

The Statute of Provisors was followed up, two years later, by another called the *Statute of Præmunire* (1353), which, after declaring that 'diverse of the people had been drawn out of the realm to answer to things whereof the cognizance pertaineth to the King's court,' enacts that all who did so were 'to appear before the King and his council, or in Chancery, or before the King's justices, to answer to the King of the contempt done in this behalf.' This statute, too, did not altogether work well. The

[1] See on these points Mullinger's 'University of Cambridge.'

complaints of the Universities are frequent and violent against it.[1]

It was not to be expected that the changes brought about by these important statutes would be accepted without a struggle. The laws were still evaded, and in 1365 another Act was passed, repeating and rendering more stringent the provisions of both, and also expressly declaring that the Statute of Præmunire applied to suitors at the Papal Court; and as the prelates who had voted for the Act were still greatly under the power of Rome, and might suffer damage for their boldness, another Act was passed for the protection of the lives and properties of prelates and other lords of Parliament. But, in spite of this protection, the unfortunate clergy were still between the upper and the nether mill-stones; ground down on the one side by the Pope, and on the other by the King, till at last, in the Convocation of 1373, when the King's demand for a subsidy was laid before them, they declared, not without reason, that they were utterly undone by the exactions, not merely of the Crown, but of the Papacy, which were repeated nearly every year, and that they could help the King better 'if the intolerable yoke of the Pope were taken from their necks.' The two parties, of one of which Courtenay, the Bishop of Hereford, was the leader, and of the other Simon Sudbury, then Bishop of London, agreed on this occasion that they could only promise the King a tenth 'if he could find some remedy for the evils from which the Church suffered.' It may be added that the Statute of Provisors was re-enacted in 1390,

[1] See, *inter alia*, Huber's 'The English Universities,' English translation, edited by F. W. Newman, vol. i., p. 173.

with additional safeguards against Papal usurpation, and the Statute of Præmunire in 1393.

Whether Pope Innocent was not at first aware of this anti-Papal legislation that was going on in England, or whether, when he was checked at one point, he thought it well to make his attack on another, or whether, as has been suggested, it was a mere piece of bravado on his part, certain it is that not long after the passing of the first Statute of Provisors and Præmunire, that is, in 1357, he had the audacity to demand of King Edward the payment of the tribute of 1,000 marks, which his ancestor John had promised. Edward, who, instead of paying money, was extracting it from every possible source for his wars and his pageants, replied indignantly that 'he would pay tribute to no one, for he did not hold his kingdom in dependence upon any.' But the irrepressible Pope was not to be discouraged; for seven years later (1374) we find the then Bishop of Ely (Simon Islip), who was Chancellor, announcing to Parliament that the King desired the advice of the estates on the subject of this payment, for which the Pope threatened to commence a suit against him; whereupon the three estates of the realm, clergy, lords, and commons, unanimously enacted that, 'if the Pope attempted to enforce his assumed but invalid claim, he should be resisted and withstood by the King and his subjects with all their puissance'; and the King gladly took the opportunity of forbidding for a time the payment even of the Peter's Pence.

The resistance to Rome had hitherto been confined to matters of jurisdiction and monetary matters; it had not yet touched any of the doctrines held by

that Church to be *de fide*. But the latter half of the fourteenth century saw the commencement of a doctrinal opposition. Not that there had been no differences of opinion on matters of faith before this period. The doctrine of Transubstantiation had been warmly discussed as early as the eleventh century, when Lanfranc had been its able defender; but it was not then an article of faith; when it was decreed to be such, little more was said about it. Again, in the early part of the fourteenth century the learned and pious Thomas Bradwardine, the 'Doctor Profundus' of the schoolmen, delivered a course of lectures to the Fellows of Merton College, which he afterwards, at their request, expanded into the great work popularly known as 'Summa Doctoris Profundi,' the proper title of which was 'De Causâ Dei contra Pelagium, et De Virtute Causarum, ad suos Mertonenses, Libri Sex.' This really struck at the root of a doctrine then generally accepted—the merit of congruity. So far from being satisfied with the doctrinal position of the Church, Bradwardine boldly affirmed that nearly the whole Church had become Pelagian; and, as a proof, he instanced the doctrine of merit *de congruo*, according to which the performance by man of certain good actions rendered it meet and equitable that God should confer upon him saving grace. He argues against human merit of any kind, basing his arguments on the principles of S. Augustine of Hippo. His treatise has been termed one of the chief sources of the Calvinistic teaching, so far as it has found expression in our English Church. It met with an able analyzer and editor in Isaac Milner. But Bradwardine never came under the censure of the Roman Church; on

the contrary, he was appointed by provision to the archbishopric of Canterbury by Pope Clement VI. in 1349. At that time popes were not so suspicious about heresy as they became a few years later; otherwise Bradwardine's strictures could scarcely have passed unchallenged. What made them suspicious was the rise of a remarkable man, round whom, as a centre, the whole history of the English Church in the later part of the fourteenth century gathers.

That man, it is almost needless to say, was *John Wiclif* (1324 ?-1384). There are few great names in English history about which so much uncertainty hangs as that of John Wiclif; and that, not only about his views and his character—these are sure to be estimated differently, according to the different predilections of writers—but even about the actual facts of his life. We can pronounce far more confidently about the careers of his contemporaries, who were infinitely lesser men, and about as great men who lived in far less familiar times. For instance, we know all about Wiclif's contemporary and opponent, William Courtenay, and all about King Alfred, who lived four hundred years earlier. But about Wiclif moot questions arise on the most leading facts of his life. What was the exact date, and what the precise place, of his birth? Which of the writings once attributed to him unhesitatingly are spurious, which genuine? What was his position at Oxford? Was he ever a member of Queen's College? Was he the Warden of Canterbury Hall? When did he begin his conflict with the mendicant friars? Which of the twenty-eight methods of spelling his name is the most correct? Was he a Socialist—nay, a Communist? Was his relationship to the Refor-

mation of the sixteenth century merely that of a precursor, or was he connected with it as cause is with effect? A flood of light has been shed upon these and other questions by modern scholars, but the result of this light is that many of them must be answered quite differently from what they would have been even fifty years ago, while upon others it has only shown us our ignorance. However, enough is known for the purposes of this sketch. That he was born in Yorkshire somewhere about the year 1320; that he was educated at Oxford, and that he remained there as a teacher after he had passed beyond the pupil stage; that he achieved a splendid reputation as the greatest scholar of his day; that he was a Fellow of Merton; that he was Master of Balliol; that he accepted, in 1361, what is still the Balliol living of Fillingham in Lincolnshire, which he exchanged, in 1368, for that of Ludgershall in Bucks, because it was nearer Oxford; that he rendered important services to King Edward III., in return for which he received the Crown living of Lutterworth; that he was for some time the protégé of the King's powerful son, John, Duke of Lancaster; that he aimed at reforming, first the discipline, and then the doctrines, of the Church; that he became more and more alienated from the Roman system; and that he was at last brought into violent collision with its staunchest supporters—all this is indisputable.

Wiclif's public life divides itself into three very distinctly defined periods: the first, which may be called the scholastic period, up to the year 1366; the second, the political period, from 1366 to 1378; the last, the exclusively theological period, from 1378 to his death in 1384.

The first, which embraces three-fourths of his whole life, is still shrouded in much obscurity; but it is certain that long before the close of it he had established his reputation as a philosopher. He was a schoolman, and, as such, carried on the great traditions of Roger Bacon, Duns Scotus, William Occam, and Thomas Bradwardine. His bitterest enemies owned his intellectual pre-eminence in this capacity. It was in 1360 that he was appointed Master of Balliol, and in 1362 that he accepted the college living of Fillingham, where he resided occasionally, making frequent visits to Oxford. He was, of course, a 'secular,' not a 'regular,' and the preponderance of evidence is in favour of his being the John Wiclif appointed by Archbishop Islip Warden of Canterbury Hall, which was expressly founded as a counter-establishment to the monastic institution of S. Frideswide close by. But though he was no doubt opposed to the regular monks, whom he called 'monks possessioners,'[1] he was in these early days a friend of the mendicant friars, whose views on property would theoretically agree with his own. He was known, in the schoolmen's language, as 'Doctor Evangelicus,' a title which unconsciously foreshadowed his future career. There is no evidence as yet of his being accounted in any way heretical, though he was no doubt regarded as being what would be called in modern language 'a radical.' Oxford was then the centre of light and leading, so there is no wonder that he should be called to take a prominent part in public life. This brings us to the second period of his career.

In 1366, when the anti-Papal feeling was particu-

[1] 'Religiosi possessionati.'

larly strong, and when the military glory of England was at its climax, Pope Urban had the courage to claim, not only the annual feudatory tribute of 1,000 marks, which King John had promised in his degradation, but also all the arrears for thirty-three years. It was on this occasion that John Wiclif emerged from the academic cloister and the country living, and became a πολιτικὸς ἀνήρ. He was a valuable acquisition to the national party, for his highly-trained intellect, his logical acumen, and the fire and vigour of his nature, were all enlisted in the popular cause. He had hitherto been known simply as the scholar and the philosopher, hardly as the controversialist at all; for the once popular opinion that he began his controversy with the mendicant orders as early as 1360, succeeding the famous Richard Fitzralph, Archbishop of Armagh, who died in that year, as their protantagonist, is quite exploded. But he now put forth a political tract in answer to a direct challenge from an anonymous Doctor of Theology (a monk, not a friar), which showed at once what a valuable ally he would be to the anti-Papal party. He describes himself in it as 'a humble and obedient son of the Church of Rome' —doubtless in all sincerity, for he had no quarrel as yet with the spiritual, but only with the political, claims of the Pope. He gives what he represents as the substance of the seven speeches of seven temporal lords in the council summoned by the King to discuss the question of paying tribute to the Pope. Whether Wiclif was himself a member of the Parliament of 1366, and gave a condensed account of what he actually heard, or whether the speeches of the seven lords are, like the speeches in

Livy and Thucydides, the invention of the writer, need not here be discussed.[1] In 1370 there were again loud outcries against the infringement of the rights of patrons by the Pope, who still persisted in making 'provisions' in spite of the Statute, or, rather, Statutes, of Provisors. Gregory XI. was now on the Papal throne, and he consented to receive commissioners from England, who were to state the grievances complained of at Bruges, where conferences were being held to settle a peace between England and France. The fact that John Wiclif's name stands first, after those of John of Gaunt and the Bishops of London and Bangor, on this royal commission, shows how highly he was esteemed as a patriotic and able statesman. The mission to Bruges was an important incident in Wiclif's life, partly as affording him a closer insight into the Papal policy, and partly as introducing him to, or bringing him into closer contact with, a Prince of the blood, with whom his name is for some years intimately associated. The concordat arrived at between the Pope and the King was a failure, and complaints of Papal extortion waxed louder and louder, until they reached a climax in the Good Parliament of 1376. As a Church reformer, Wiclif saw with deep indignation preferments conferred, chiefly through Papal influence, upon persons who could not, or did not, attend to the duties of their office. As a patriot, he saw with equal indignation money which was sorely needed for the exigencies of the country going out of the kingdom to enrich

[1] Professor Montagu Burrows gives strong reasons for the latter view ; but Bishop Stubbs seems to give the weight of his great authority to the former.

foreigners, and he heartily approved of the outspoken but fruitless remonstrances which were made to the King by this Parliament. In 1377 he published a tract, 'De Juramento Arnaldi,' in which he boldly charged the Papal collector, Arnold Garnier, with perjury, because for five years (from 1372) he had been breaking his oath never to violate the rights and interests of the country, while all the time he was collecting a large amount of gold in England to be carried out of the kingdom. But even yet Wiclif did not, any more than the Good Parliament, impugn the *spiritual* rights of Rome. Both took the same line that Grosseteste had taken a century earlier, maintaining that it was the abuse of the Popedom, not the Popedom itself, that was to be resisted. 'God,' to use the oft-repeated expression, 'had entrusted the care of the sheep to the Holy Father to feed them, not to fleece them.'

Whether Wiclif himself was a member of the Good Parliament of 1376 may be doubtful, but it is certain that he was now a most influential person in politico-ecclesiastical affairs, and that his influence was used on the side of national independence, both in Church and State. The remonstrances of the Good Parliament were of no effect, for the King, who had long been failing both in body and mind, was nearing his end. The Black Prince, his eldest son, died June 8, 1376; the old King, in his dotage, was ingloriously ruled by an unprincipled woman, Alice Perrers; and Wiclif's unworthy patron, John of Gaunt, Duke of Lancaster, had the chief management of affairs, though the nation chafed under his unpopular *régime*. Edward III. had in the time of his power been a friend of Wiclif, who is termed 'peculiaris

regis clericus,' whatever that may mean; he had bestowed upon him more than one prebend, and then the Crown living of Lutterworth. But Wiclif never was a pluralist; on his appointment to each fresh office, he resigned the one he held previously, and therefore could with a good grace inveigh against pluralities. But in point of fact, considering the high reputation and great prominence of the man, and the powerful friends he possessed, the smallness of his preferments was quite unique, and can only be accounted for by supposing that he was already suspected of unsoundness, if not in theological, at any rate in politico-ecclesiastical questions. Indeed, future events show that this was the case.

In February, 1377, Wiclif was summoned to appear before the Convocation of Canterbury assembled at S. Paul's. He came, supported by the Duke of Lancaster and Lord Henry Percy, Grand-Marshal of England. The Archbishop of Canterbury, Simon Sudbury, who, as Bishop of London, had been fellow-commissioner with the Duke and Wiclif, would be *ex-officio* president; but partly, perhaps, on account of his known intimacy with Wiclif, partly because Wiclif, as belonging to the household of the Duke, was under the jurisdiction of the Bishop of London, William Courtenay took the leading part. The result of the meeting was an absurd fiasco; Wiclif's case was not even heard; the proceedings resolved themselves into a squabble between the Duke and the Bishop, and the sitting broke up before 9 a.m. To make confusion worse confounded, Wiclif, who was essentially a popular leader, found himself on the unpopular side; the citizens of London, with whom Courtenay was very

popular, rose in defence of their Bishop, who had, they thought, been insulted by the Duke and the Grand-Marshal; and a riot was stayed only by the intervention of the widow of the Black Prince.

Wiclif's alliance with the Duke of Lancaster was, through no fault of his own, an unfortunate, but not an unaccountable, one. Both had arrived by different roads at the same end. Both were opposed to the temporal influence of the clergy, but from wholly different motives — the Duke for purely political reasons, because the clergy as a body were hostile to the party of which he was the leader; Wiclif for religious reasons, because he thought that their wealth and political power were injurious to the true spiritual interests of the Church.

It was not to be expected that, because Wiclif had escaped by a kind of accident the censures of Convocation, he would be left in peace. The clergy were incensed at his strictures, both in his lectures at Oxford and in his published works, against their worldliness, and they determined to call in the aid of an authority higher than that of even royal dukes and grand-marshals. They rebelled against the Pope's exactions, but they still respected his spiritual authority. They therefore selected a number of propositions set forth by Wiclif, and sent them to the Pope, whose action in reply was prompt and effective. He put his hand to five Bulls against Wiclif, which were sent to the Archbishop of Canterbury, to the Bishop of London, to the King, to the Chancellor, and to the University of Oxford respectively. Archbishop Sudbury and Bishop Courtenay were to act as Papal delegates, and ascertain whether

the opinions attributed to Wiclif were really his. The nineteen propositions were as follows :

'1. All mankind that have been since Christ have not power to ordain that Peter and all his family should have political dominion over the world.

'2. God cannot give to man, for himself and his heirs, civil dominion for ever.

'3. Charters of human invention concerning a perpetual civil inheritance are impossible.

'4. Everyone that continues in grace to the end has not only a right to, but in fact enjoys, all the good things of God.

'5. Man can only give ministerially to his son, whether natural or adopted in the school of Christ, temporal or eternal dominion.

'6. If God may, so may also temporal lords, take away the goods of fortune from a delinquent Church.

'7. Whether the Church be in such a state or not, it is not my business to examine, but the business of temporal lords, who, if they find it in such a state, are to act boldly, and on the penalty of damnation to take away its temporalities.

'8. We know that it is impossible that the Vicar of Christ should, purely by his Bulls, or by them with the will and consent of himself and his college of cardinals, qualify or disqualify anyone.

'9. It is not possible for a man to be excommunicated unless he be first and principally excommunicated by himself.

'10. Nobody is excommunicated, suspended, or tormented with other censures, so that he is the worse for it, unless it be in the cause of God (or where God approves the cause).

'11. Cursing or excommunication does not bind simply, but only so far as it is denounced against an adversary of the law of Christ.

'12. Christ has given to His disciples no example of a power to excommunicate subjects principally for their denying them temporal things, but has rather given them an example to the contrary.

'13. The disciples of Christ have no power forcibly to exact temporal things by censures.

'14. It is not possible even for the absolute power of God to cause that if the Pope or any other pretends that he binds or looses at any rate, that he does therefore actually bind and loose.

'15. We ought to believe that then only does the Pope bind and loose, when he conforms himself to the law of Christ.

'16. This ought to be universally believed, that every priest rightly ordained has a power of administering every one of the Sacraments, and, by consequence, of absolving any contrite person from any sin.

'17. It is lawful for kings to take away temporalities from ecclesiastics who abuse them.

'18. Whether temporal lords, or holy popes, or saints, or the Head of the Church, which is Christ, have endowed the Church with the goods of fortune or of grace, and have excommunicated those who take away its temporalities, it is notwithstanding lawful, on account of the condition implied in the endowment, to spoil her of her temporalities proportionately to the offence.

'19. An ecclesiastic, yea, even the Pope of Rome, may lawfully be corrected by subjects, and even the laity, and may also be accused and impeached by them.'

We can well understand how these propositions would be highly offensive to the Pope, and, for the matter of that, to many English Churchmen, for they touch the rights of property in general, and of Church property in particular, distinctly justifying the secularization of the latter under certain circumstances ;[1] they limit the extent of Church discipline in a way that was, to say the least, not generally recognised in Wiclif's day ; and they minimize the power of the keys.

The prosecution of Wiclif was delayed through the death of the King (June 21, 1377), the coronation of the new King, and the threatening movement of the French in the South and of the Scots in the North. It is also probable that the commissioners were not very keen about carrying out their orders, and they certainly met with little encouragement when they sent the Papal Bull to Oxford. At last, however, Wiclif was cited to appear at S. Paul's, before the Pope's commissioners ; but the venue was afterwards changed to the Archbishop's palace at Lambeth. The change was fatal, and the second trial ended, like the first, in a ludicrous fiasco. The citizens of London again interposed, but this time in favour of Wiclif, thinking probably that the trial was to be huddled through in a not sufficiently public place. The Princess-Dowager—now, of course, with increased authority as mother of the reigning monarch —again interposed, and Wiclif was allowed to go free, with a formal admonition.

[1] Wiclif's favourite maxim was that 'dominion or right to property is founded on grace.' Forfeiture is the punishment of treason ; sin is treason against God ; all property is ultimately derived from God ; ergo, etc.

Soon after the futile trial at Lambeth, Gregory XI. died (March 27, 1378), and thereupon arose the great Papal schism of thirty years, which in more ways than one deeply affected the last, and by far the most important, epoch of Wiclif's career. It had the effect of widening the breach between him and the English Church, by drawing both in different directions. On the one hand, it alienated Wiclif farther from the Papal system; on the other, it made the English Church generally less hostile to that system.

This requires explanation.

There was now an Italian Pope at Rome—Urban VI.—and a French Pope at Avignon—Clement VII.—each anathematizing the other; each declaring that the adherents of the other were heretics and schismatics. This unedifying spectacle gave a final blow to Wiclif's loyalty, which had long been waning, to the Papal authority. If they could not agree which was the head of the Church, might not the reason be that neither was? 'If,' he remarked, at the close of 1378, 'Urban departs from the right way, then is his election a mistaken one; and in this case it would not be a little for the good of the Church to want both Popes alike.' This line of thought led Wiclif on, step by step, until he came to the conclusion that the Pope (whichever might be he) was none other than Antichrist.

On the other hand, the English Church generally had no difficulty about recognising the Italian Pope, Urban, as the true Pope; and this recognition cleared away at once many of her grievances against the Papacy. The Pope was no longer identified with the national enemy of England; he was once

more connected with the city which was universally regarded as the head of Western Christendom; Christian people might admit his authority as Churchmen without detriment to their patriotism as Englishmen.

If 1378 is an important date in Wicliff's career as the date of his change of attitude towards the Papacy, 1381 is an equally important one as the date at which he openly opposed the crucial doctrine of the Roman Church—the doctrine of Transubstantiation. It was in the summer of this year that he put forth the following bold theses, which summed up the conclusions at which he had arrived, after two or three years' study of the question, since his final break with the Papacy:

'1. The consecrated Host which we see upon the altar is neither Christ nor any part of Him, but an efficacious sign of Him.

'2. No passer-by can see Christ with his bodily eye in the consecrated Host, but can only see Him by faith.

'3. Of old time the faith of the Roman Church was, according to the profession of Berengarius, that the bread and wine which remain after benediction are the consecrated Host.

'4. The Eucharist has, by virtue of the sacramental words, as well the body as the blood of Christ truly and really in every part of it.

'5. Transubstantiation, identification, and impanation . . . are not to be established from Scripture.

'6. It is in opposition to the opinions of saints to assert that there is the accident without the subject in the true Host.

'7. The Sacrament of the Eucharist is in its nature

bread and wine, containing, by virtue of the Sacramental words, the true body and blood of Christ in every part of it.

'8. The Sacrament of the Eucharist is in figure the body and blood of Christ into which the bread and wine are transubstantiated, which remain something after consecration, although, as the faithful believe, their nature is laid asleep.

'9. The existence of accident without substance is not probable. If it be, God is annihilated, and every article of the Christian faith perishes.

'10. Any person or sect is heretical which shall obstinately maintain that the Sacrament of the altar is bread existing by itself, and thus in its nature more abject and imperfect than horse bread.

'11. Whosoever shall pertinaciously defend that the said Sacrament is an accident, a quality or quantity, or an aggregation of these, falls into the heresy above spoken of.

'12. Wheaten bread, in which alone it is lawful to consecrate, is in its nature infinitely more perfect than bean bread or rat's bread, both of which are in their nature more perfect than an accident.'

Archdeacon Perry has well remarked that 'these propositions would seem to some at Oxford to be as great heresies scholastically as doctrinally,'[1] for the schoolmen justified the doctrine of Transubstantiation on the philosophical ground that accident might exist without substance. Nevertheless, it was on theological, not on philosophical, grounds that the University immediately took action against her distinguished son. The Chancellor, William Berton, called together a number of men 'learned in

[1] 'Student's English Church History,' vol. i., ch. xx., p. 429.

theology and laws,' of whom the majority were monks—and half of these monks friars—and, as a result of their deliberations, the theses were pronounced erroneous and heretical, and were prohibited from being publicly taught.

Wiclif, however, was not silenced. He could no longer declare his Sacramental views orally at Oxford; but his pen was all the more busy in disseminating them, and in his many writings from this time forward he constantly recurs to the doctrines maintained in the theses. It is probably from this period that we may date his internecine warfare with the mendicant orders. At first he naturally regarded them as friends, fighting the same battle with himself. *His* object was to reform the Church from within, and so was *theirs*. *His* view was, that the great hindrance to Church reform was the wealth of the clergy; *their* very *raison d'être* was the virtue of voluntary poverty. But the friars were the advocates of Papal absolutism[1]; Wiclif felt more and more strongly that the Papal rule was the rule of Antichrist; and in other points, both of principle and practice, he and the friars were at variance; and, as is not unusual, the nearer they agreed on certain questions, the more exasperated were they against

[1] This is not inconsistent with the fact insisted upon by Mr. Green, that 'the University of Oxford, which had fallen under the direction of the friars' teaching, stood first in its resistance to Papal exactions and its claim of English liberty' ('Short History,' etc, ch. iii., § 6, p. 147); and that the friars were, as a rule, on the side of the barons, and the Pope on the side of the King, in the barons' war: for a marked distinction was drawn between the political and the spiritual side of the Papal authority; and by 'Papal absolutism' I mean absolutism in spiritual things.

one another when they differed. There is no wonder that the breach between them was irreparable.

Another event occurred in 1381 which, indirectly but very really, led Wiclif to turn his exclusive attention from politico-ecclesiastical to purely theological questions. This was the revolt of the peasants, commonly known as Wat Tyler's rebellion. That Wiclif ever for a moment intended to encourage such an outbreak is incredible. He had keenness enough to see that it was calculated to do far more harm than good to the object he had in view; and he was doubtless quite sincere when he termed it *lamentabilis conflictus*. The alleged evidence of one of the ringleaders—John Ball—that he had learnt his lesson from Wiclif and his poor priests is (even assuming it to be genuine) more than counterbalanced by the inherent improbability of the thing, by the express testimony of Wiclif himself, and by the fact that the object of the peasants' special abhorrence—John of Gaunt—was Wiclif's own patron. At the same time, we can well understand that this terrible revolt, culminating, as it did, in the murder of an Archbishop of Canterbury, who had once been Wiclif's friend and companion, and who had always shrunk from taking proceedings against him, might well make Wiclif feel that he was playing with edged tools when he advocated any tampering with the rights of property, and that it would be wise in him for the future to avoid politics and devote himself to theology. Moreover, if he could answer for himself, he could not answer for his followers, who were now an increasing body; least of all for the itinerant priests, who had been

trained by him, and who were now going about the country, teaching in his name.

These 'poor priests' appear to have been in the first instance Wiclif's pupils (as we should now call them) at Oxford. They were ordained, as their name shows; but even in Wiclif's lifetime, and still more after his death, laymen began to be admitted into the order, if order it can be called. There is no doubt that they looked up to Wiclif as their spiritual and ecclesiastical guide, and that they adopted all his views, both doctrinal and practical, which they advocated, as is not unusual, with more than their principal's ardour. But that they were ever bound to him by such a tie as that by which Wesley's itinerants, for instance, were bound to *him* is not quite clear.

The murder of Archbishop Sudbury by the peasants made way for a determined enemy of Wiclif to the primacy. William Courtenay, who had already shown his hostility as Bishop of London, became Archbishop of Canterbury, and the results were quickly seen. On May 17, 1382, the new Archbishop gathered a number of divines together, selected by himself, in the hall of the Dominican monastery at Blackfriars — an ominous place of meeting, for Wiclif was now at daggers drawn with the friars. The occurrence of a serious earthquake on the day gave the council the name of 'the Earthquake Council.' Archbishop Courtenay dexterously turned the evil omen to his own purposes, and of the twenty-four articles brought against Wiclif, ten were pronounced heretical and fourteen erroneous. To impress the importance of the crisis upon the populace, a solemn procession of clergy and laity was

arranged to walk barefoot through the streets of London, ending with a sermon against the condemned articles by John Cunningham, a Carmelite monk.

But the Archbishop was not content with these irregular ecclesiastical censures; he strove also to enlist the secular arm on his side, and so far succeeded as to procure the assent of the Lords to a statute for bringing to punishment the itinerant preachers (Wiclif is not mentioned by name). The assent of the Commons was not obtained—perhaps not asked—but the young King was induced to admit among the statutes of the realm an order for the imprisonment of itinerant preachers and their adherents; and a month later Richard was persuaded by the Archbishop to issue letters patent authorizing the Primate and his suffragans 'to arrest and detain in their own prisons, or in any other, at their discretion, all and singular who privately or publicly preach the condemned conclusions, wherever they may be found, till they shall repent of the pravities of these errors and heresies.'

Wiclif's own University was not so easily managed. The Chancellor, Dr. Rugge, was, if not himself a Wiclifite, a favourer of the party, which was strong at Oxford. The Archbishop sent his commissary, Peter Stokes, a Carmelite friar, with his mandate to the Chancellor that the University should condemn the teaching of Wiclif; but the Chancellor boldly declared that no Bishop nor Archbishop had any authority or jurisdiction within the University, even in matters of heresy. It happened that the Festival of Corpus Christi (June 5) was at hand, a day on which the University preacher at St. Frideswide's

Church would naturally give his views on the presence of our Blessed Lord in the Holy Eucharist. The preacher was Dr. Repyngdon, afterwards Bishop of Lincoln. He did not directly traverse the doctrine of Transubstantiation, but declared that Dr. Wiclif was 'in thorough agreement with the true doctrine of the Universal Church on the Sacraments,' and referred to his itinerant preachers as 'holy priests.' After the service, the Chancellor congratulated the preacher on his sermon. This was not promising for Dr. Stokes's commission; he seems to have apprehended personal violence, and was thankful to be able to leave Oxford unharmed, but *re infectâ*.[1]

Archbishop Courtenay, however, was a determined man, and would not let the matter rest. He procured for himself the office of 'Inquisitor' (ominous title!) 'hæreticæ pravitatis per totam provinciam.' Several of Wiclif's Oxford sympathizers were examined, and some (Repyngdon among them[2]) forced to recant; but Wiclif remained untouched, and spent the short remainder of his life at Lutterworth, where he died, December 31, 1384.

There yet remains to be noticed Wiclif's translation of the whole of the Bible into English. All the translation of the New Testament was his own work; that of the Old Testament was done under his direction, chiefly by his follower, Nicolas Here-

[1] For a full account of this affair, see an article in the *Church Quarterly Review*, October, 1884, No. 19, 'Cardinal Repyngdon and the Followers of Wickliffe.'

[2] Repyngdon afterwards became an active enemy of the Wiclifites, and rose to great eminence, being made first Bishop of Lincoln, and then a Cardinal.

ford. Apart from its theological value, the work is a monumental work, as the first specimen of Middle English prose. Of course, as a translation, it was soon superseded; for the New Testament was necessarily a translation from the Vulgate, since Wiclif knew no Greek. But the pains he took may be judged from the fact that, after the translation was finished, he actually commenced another, which did not appear till some years after his death; the chief instrument in this revised translation was John Purvey, Wiclif's coadjutor in the parish of Lutterworth. There are, therefore, two translations of the Bible which pass under the name of 'Wiclif's Bible,' the original and the revised one; and these two are sometimes apt to be confounded.

Next to Archbishop Courtenay, the man who took the leading part in the proceedings against Wiclif both at Oxford and in London, but who was more inclined to leniency than the Primate, was the Bishop of Winchester, William of Wykeham; and it would be indeed ungrateful in any historian of the Church in the fourteenth century to ignore one of its most munificent benefactors. William of Wykeham (1324-1404), so called from the place of his birth,[1] rose,

[1] 'A loco unde natus est, non a parentibus,' whose names are said to have been John and Sybil Longe. 'His parents,' says Dr. Lowth, 'were persons of good reputation and character, but in mean circumstances. . . . His mother,' he adds, 'was well born, and of a gentleman's family' (Lowth's 'Life of William of Wykeham,' pp. 9, 10). Dr. Lowth refutes the depreciatory notes on this great man which were copied by John Leland, the antiquary, from a 'Report' of one Dr. Loudon, and repeated by Holinshed and other chroniclers, and afterwards published by Thomas Hearne, forming the appendix to the fourth volume of Leland's 'Itinerary.' Lowth's was the best 'Life' until the publi-

without any advantages of high birth such as two successive archbishops of the time, Courtenay and Arundel, possessed, or of high University distinction, such as Wiclif achieved, to be the second man in the kingdom under Edward III. He used both vast wealth and his influence for high and worthy purposes, 'being the most generous and public-spirited of men' (Lowth). He was at least as much a statesman as an ecclesiastic, but he was one of the best specimens of the statesmen-prelates of the Middle Ages. He certainly did not rise above the spirit of his age in the matter of amassing preferments, but he used their revenues for unselfish ends. He was educated at Winchester, which had long been famous for its 'High' or 'Great Grammar' School, before Wykeham made it still more famous by his far more magnificent foundation; and it was here that he learned the science of architecture which was the first cause of his rise. Without entering into the details of his early life, it is enough to say that he won the King's good graces by proving himself an excellent clerk of the works in superintending the building arrangements, first at two royal manors (Henley and Easthampstead), and then at Windsor Castle.[1] It is doubtful whether he ever had any University education at all, but he was admitted into minor Orders, and this gave the King an opportunity of rewarding his favourite surveyor with a

cation of the 'Life of William of Wykeham,' by G. H. Moberly, in 1887, which has quite superseded it.

[1] For a full and most interesting account of the whole of this part of his history, the reader must be referred to Mr. Moberly's 'Life,' chs. i. and ii., in which also several inaccuracies in the earlier 'Lives' are corrected.

perfect plethora of preferments. Many of these preferments were conferred upon him before he was in full Orders, but he was at last ordained acolyte in 1361, and sub-deacon and priest in 1362 by Bishop Edingdon, his early patron, who had introduced him to Edward III. He is said to have held no less than seventeen benefices, besides being Keeper of the Privy Seal and Secretary of State. 'At this time,' writes Froissart, 'reigned a priest in England, called Sir William de Wican, and this William de Wican was so much in favour with the King of England, that by him everything was done, and without him they did nothing.'[1] In 1367, on the death of Bishop Edingdon, he rose *per saltum* to the wealthy and important see of Winchester. He made a better Bishop than might have been expected from his antecedents,[2] being very energetic in his diocese,

[1] Quoted by Mr. Moberly, 'Life of William of Wykeham,' p. 30.

[2] A change seems to have passed over him, for one who was almost a contemporary writes of him: 'He was consecrated to be Bishop of Winchester in 1367, in the fortieth year of the reign of King Edward III., and the forty-third of his age. And now, in order to attain the grace of the Sacrament, as well as the Sacrament itself, he set himself to renew his old man, and clothed himself with the new man, which after God is created. And remembering what heights he had climbed, what as a layman he had neglected, he did his best to redeem the time. Wherefore, as if changed to another man, he set before himself this rule of life: to be on equal terms with his servants, humble to priests, kind to the people, compassionate to the wretched, bountiful to the needy. Considering that he was made the father of many nations, he thought that the truest step towards renewal must begin with himself, and that if he first learnt to rule himself, he would really be able to rule others in the right way. So he subdued his body, and brought it under servitude to God, and so taught it to be the handmaid of the spirit' (Heath, quoted by Mr. Moberly, 'Life,' etc., pp. 87, 88).

reforming abuses, requiring the monasteries to conform to the rules of their respective orders, and paying especial attention to the wealthy and important abbey of S. Cross in his immediate neighbourhood. He had a fine scope for gratifying his taste for architecure, for there were no less than sixteen manors belonging to his see, the houses of which he repaired; and he completely metamorphosed the nave of Winchester Cathedral, turning it from a Norman into a Perpendicular edifice. But this was in the later part of his episcopate. In the earlier part he was chiefly known as a very able statesman and lawyer, and was twice Chancellor of England.[1] The time, however, had arrived when the laity began to be jealous of the predominant influence which the clergy exercised in politics, and the chief object of their jealousy was the statesman-bishop of Winchester. The ascendancy of John of Gaunt, in his father's old age, rendered it possible for them to show the effects of their jealousy; for the Duke was always an enemy of the clergy. Accordingly, in 1371, the Bishop was deprived of the chancellorship, and a little later was prosecuted for defalcations. The charge was apparently unjust, but it was proved to the satisfaction of prejudiced minds; Wykeham's episcopal revenues were sequestrated, and himself forbidden to come within twenty miles of Court. The death of the Black Prince in 1376 gave still greater power to the Duke of Lancaster and the anti-clerical party, and so strong was the feeling against the Bishop of Winchester that he was expressly excepted from the general pardon which

[1] The Chancellor was not termed *Lord* Chancellor till Henry VI.'s reign. Stafford was the first Lord Chancellor.

was granted in honour of the King's jubilee in 1377; he was also excluded from Parliament, but he was summoned to Convocation, where the clergy refused to grant a subsidy until justice was done to him.[1] The King's death, on June 21, 1377, altered the whole state of affairs. The temporalities of his see were restored to the Bishop, and he again rose into power, his name appearing in all the commissions for settling the disturbed state of the kingdom, and he remained in power until his death in 1404.

William of Wykeham was a more spiritually-minded man than his many secular and quasi-secular avocations would lead us to expect. These latter were apparently forced upon him, because he was the most competent man that could be found. Personally he lived a self-denying life, in spite of his vast wealth, and he took great pains in ministering to the sick and dying.

But of course his great title to the gratitude of posterity is the foundation of his two famous colleges at Winchester and Oxford, for which he had been making preparations for many years. Both were founded for a strictly religious purpose; that is, in order to train a more learned and pious class of clergy —a work sorely needed. To this end he conceived the noble project of 'providing for the perpetual maintenance of two hundred scholars, to provide them a liberal support, and to lead them through a liberal course of education; from the first elements of letters, through the whole circle of the sciences, from the lowest class of grammatical learning to the highest degrees of the several faculties.'[2] At Oxford

[1] For a full account, see Moberly, pp. 118-148.

[2] Lowth, p. 182.

he founded the society before he raised the building, and at Winchester he began with a private grammar-school before he established the college. The College of S. Mary of Winchester at Oxford (the 'New College') was not finished and occupied until 1386; the statutes were drawn up with great care, and frequently revised, by Wykeham himself. He commenced the 'College of S. Marie' at Winchester the year after he had finished that at Oxford; the first stone was laid March 26, 1387, and it was completed in March, 1393. If not a learned man himself, William of Wykeham was one of the greatest encouragers of learning in others that England has ever seen. And that, not only by his own two noble foundations, but also because he set an example which was avowedly followed by others. Henry Chichele was educated at Winchester and New College, and he took Wykeham for his pattern when he founded his College of All Souls at Oxford; Henry VI. founded Eton College and King's College, Cambridge, on the model of Winchester and New, intending to reproduce on a grander scale Wykeham's two colleges; and William of Waynflete was Master of Winchester, and was fired with an ambition to tread in the steps of his founder, when he established his magnificent foundation of Magdalen College, Oxford.

The name of a prelate of a very different type from that of William of Wykeham introduces us to a strange episode in the history of the Church in England during the later part of the fourteenth-century. This was Henry Spencer, Bishop of Norwich, who led the Papal Crusade against the Clementines, or followers of Clement VII., the rival

Pope set up against Urban VI., whom all the English Church accepted. Bishop Spencer was the most martial of all the martial prelates in the Middle Ages. He had been a man of war from his youth, and, finding no employment in his own land, he had sought a commission in the army of Pope Urban V., who bestowed upon him an odd reward for his military services by making him, by provision, Bishop of Norwich. It is fair to add that the young prelate at once gave up his warlike propensities, resided in his diocese, and strove to do his duty conscientiously therein. But an occasion occurred in which the prelate and ci-devant soldier might at once do his duty as Bishop (according to his lights) and at the same time whet his military appetite and show his military prowess. The peasants' revolt of 1381 spread into the diocese of Norwich, and the Bishop, on learning that the insurgents had risen and that the people were afraid to resist them, at once donned his armour, and advanced against them at the head of a small troop. Having successfully routed the first body he met, he went forward, gathering strength as he went, and put an end to the rebellion in that part of England. He treated the rebels with a stern vengeance, which might perhaps be necessary, but which certainly savoured more of the military despot than of the Christian Bishop.

Whether the fame of his heroism reached the ears of the Pope, or whether he himself desired to win laurels in a nobler field, certain it is that he obtained a commission from Urban VI. to lead a Crusade against the adherents of Clement. Urban threw himself heartily into the scheme, promising a plenary absolution, and the same rights which a

Crusader to the Holy Land enjoyed, to all who took part in or assisted this novel Crusade. The Parliament of November, 1382, took up the matter warmly; the mendicant orders used their immense influence in the pulpit and the confessional to promote it; Archbishop Courtenay issued mandates in its support, appealing judiciously, not only to the religion, but to the patriotism, of the people, by pointing out that France, the enemy of England, was the main supporter of Clement, and that the war would be virtually directed against France. An intense enthusiasm was created, and large sums were contributed towards the necessary expenses; and in May, 1383, the warrior-prelate set forth for Flanders. He gained at first some slight successes and exercised great severity, not to say cruelty, against the vanquished. But he soon lost all that he had gained, and made his way back to England with difficulty in October, after an ignominious failure. He was punished by the forfeiture of the temporalities of his see for two years, when they were restored to him by King Richard II., apparently through the intercession of Arundel, then Bishop of Ely.

The only result of the wild enterprise was an increase of Lollardism. Wiclif had inveighed against the whole scheme in a stirring tract, entitled 'Cruciata; or, Against the War of the Clergy,' which he published, with characteristic boldness, just at the time when the enthusiasm for the Crusade was at its height; the disastrous result tended to advance his cause, which, as we shall see in the next chapter, flourished widely after the death of the founder at the close of 1384.

CHAPTER X.

THE MEDIÆVAL CHURCH.

From the Death of Wiclif to the Accession of Henry VII.
(1384-1485).

The Lollards—Arundel, Archbishop of Canterbury—Henry IV. hostile to Lollards—Statute *De Hæretico Comburendo*—William Sawtrey burnt—Suppression of alien priories—Arundel's Constitutions—Anti-clerical party—Henry V. hostile to Lollards—Sir John Oldcastle, Lord Cobham—New statute against Lollards—Burning of John Claydon and William Taillour—Reformers within the Church—Robert Hallam—William Gascoigne—Henry VI.—Beaufort made Cardinal and Papal Legate—Reginald Pecock—Archbishop Chichele, and foundation of All Souls', Oxford—Foundation of Eton, and of King's and Queens' Colleges, Cambridge—William of Waynflete—Foundation of Magdalen College—of Lincoln College—Colleges and schools instead of monasteries—Decline of 'regulars' and rise of 'seculars.'

It should never be forgotten that Wiclif was a schoolman, and that, after the fashion of the scholastic philosophy, he was wont to put forth theses which were not intended to be applied to practical life, but to be regarded as questions to be argued about, having reference rather to an ideal than to the actual state of things. But his simple followers knew nothing about scholasticism, and did not understand such fine distinctions. There is little doubt that the Wiclifites, or Lollards (for the two terms began to be regarded as synonymous, though

they were really not so), *did* express sentiments which, if carried into action, might have been highly dangerous to the constitution both of Church and State. And there was certainly some pretext, if not justification, for the determined attempts of Archbishop Courtenay and his successor, Archbishop Arundel, to stamp out Lollardy.

No great progress, however, could be made while the unfortunate Richard II. was still upon the throne; for the King was himself half inclined to Lollardism, and men were so engrossed with the struggles of political parties that they had little time to think about heresy. Moreover, there was still a danger to be met at the opposite extreme, for the Pope was still making encroachments, and there was need to re-enact with stricter precautions the two great anti-Papal Statutes of Provisors and Præmunire. Meanwhile the Lollards increased so rapidly that Knighton —perhaps with some exaggeration—declares that if two persons were met travelling on the road, it was much if one of the two was not a Wiclifite.

In 1388 an address was presented to the King from the Parliament, complaining of the spread of Lollardism; and Richard, in consequence, constituted by letters patent two inquisitors (Brightwall and Chisulden) to examine into the Lollards' books; and if the examination proved them to be dangerous, Lollards were to be committed to gaol. In accordance with this regulation, we find, in 1389, Archbishop Courtenay trying some Lollards at Leicester, which, from its neighbourhood to Lutterworth, was naturally a stronghold of the party, and a penance was inflicted upon three unfortunate people—William Smith, and Roger and Alice Dexter—which can only

be described as disgusting. The friars, who were still a power in the Church, were, of course, especially hostile to the followers of their arch-enemy, who, as itinerant preachers, were beating them with their own weapons. Nevertheless, the Lollards still increased, both in number and influence, until, in 1394, they were strong enough to bring a Bill into Parliament, in which they boldly set forth their views under twelve heads, or 'Conclusions,' a transcription of which will help to show what Lollardism was:

1. That from the moment that the Church of England accepted endowments, faith, hope, and charity began to disappear, and pride and mortal sins to prevail.

2. That the office of priesthood, as conferred by the ritual used by the Church, is not a true priesthood, but a sham.

3. That the vow of chastity enforced on the priesthood leads to divers abominable sins.

4. That the pretended miracle of the Sacrament of bread leads all men—save a few—into idolatry; because they think that the body of Christ, which never is out of heaven, can, by virtue of the words of a priest, be essentially included in a little bit of bread which they show to the people.

5. That exorcisms and blessings of wine, bread, water, oil, salt, etc., the walls of the church, vestments, chalices, mitres, etc., are practices of necromancy rather than of sacred theology.

6. That the holding of temporal offices by prelates and clergy is altogether opposed to right principle.

7. That special prayers for particular dead persons, who are named, is a preferring of one before the other, and a false foundation for almsgiving; and

thus all the eleemosynary houses in England are on a wrong foundation.

8. That pilgrimages, prayers, and offerings made to crosses and images are very near to idolatry; and that of all images that of the Trinity is most to be condemned.

9. That auricular confession and the pretended power of absolution exalt the pride of priests, and produce many evil consequences.

10. That homicide in war, or by the pretended law of justice for temporal causes, without any spiritual revelation, is expressly contrary to the New Testament.

11. That vows of chastity taken by women lead to horrible sins.

12. That the multitude of unnecessary arts practised in the kingdom nourishes and produces much evil and sin.

These 'Conclusions' were not only submitted to Parliament, but posted on the doors of St. Paul's and Westminster Abbey, so that all might see them.

Two years later (1396) their chief opponent, Archbishop Courtenay, died; but he was succeeded in the primacy by Thomas Arundel, who was at least as hostile, and had a better chance of making his hostility felt than Courtenay had. For in 1399 a new King came to the throne, who could be much more easily incited to extirpate Lollardy than his predecessor. Henry IV. was a religious man personally, of the Roman type, who lived a pure life and hoped to die a Crusader. He was bound by the closest ties to the clergy. Archbishop Arundel had been his friend in his exile; they had returned to England together; and it was largely through the

Archbishop's influence that he had received the crown. His position was so doubtful that it was important for him to retain the powerful support of the clerical party; and, being the son of the late leader of the *anti*-clerical party—John of Gaunt, who had also been Wiclif's patron—it was necessary for him to show that he had inherited none of his father's predilections. Thus conviction and interest led him the same way; and if he had any hesitation, there was Archbishop Arundel at hand to keep him firm. Cynics say that more harm has been done by the mistakes of good men than by the crimes of bad ones; and the results of the policy of the King and the Archbishop might be cited as an illustration. They were both honest and sincere in their convictions, but they were the chief causes of the introduction of what was the bane and disgrace of the Church and the nation for more than four centuries. Religious persecution may be said to have begun in England with Henry and Arundel in 1401, and not to have ended until the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts in 1828, and the removal of Roman Catholic disabilities in 1829. Hitherto, though cruelty may have been practised in individual cases in the name of religion, it had not been sanctioned by law. And yet it can scarcely be said that there had been no pretext for persecution. At the Council of Merton, in 1305, it was stated that there were in every parish heretics, and some persons who professed infidelity; but the council was content to give to the clergy the very reasonable and moderate exhortation 'to be particular in exacting from such persons the payment of their tithes.'[1]

[1] See Hook's 'Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury,' iii. 428.

But in 1401 our Statute Book was disgraced by the statute *De Hæretico Comburendo*, which was not only disastrous in its direct results, but also let in the thin end of the wedge of that most unchristian policy, religious persecution; and the two men who were mainly responsible (under severe provocation, it must be owned) for the evil change were King Henry IV. and Archbishop Arundel. On January 26, 1401, the Archbishop called the clergy together in Convocation, and told them plainly that the object of their meeting was to put down the Lollards. Both the Upper and the Lower Houses of Parliament took a similar course, and the King, nothing loath, granted a petition (that is, as *we* should say, agreed to a Bill) that a statute should be framed, according to which an impenitent or relapsed heretic, convicted before the spiritual court, was to be delivered to the secular arm to be burnt, while all heretical books were to be also burnt.[1] It was not long before the Act was put into force—if, indeed, proceedings were not actually taken before the measure became law.

On February 12, William Sawtrey, a chantry priest at S. Osyth's in London, was charged before Convocation with having held and taught false doctrines in the diocese of Norwich (at S. Margaret's, King's Lynn), and then, after having abjured them before the Bishop of the diocese (the warlike Spencer), with having taught them again in the diocese of London. He was therefore 'a relapsed heretic,' for whom there was no mercy; and on February 26 a royal writ was issued for his execution, and he was burnt at Smithfield. John Purvey,

[1] Bishop Stubbs, 'Const. Hist.,' vol. iii., ch. xviii., p. 33.

who has been previously mentioned as a coadjutor of Wiclif, both in the parish of Lutterworth and in the work of translating the Bible, would have shared the same fate had he not recanted.

But the anti-clerical party in Parliament was still strong. In 1402 the suppression of all alien priories was enacted—a measure in itself not to be regretted, but one that was indicative of an anti-clerical feeling. In 1404 the Lack-learning Parliament—so called because all lawyers were excluded—advised that 'as the exchequer was exhausted, and as the greater part of the property of the kingdom was engrossed by the clergy, who were living in idleness and did little for the public good, the revenues of the Church should be confiscated, and applied to national purposes.' The advice was, of course, not taken, but the bitter animus it showed alarmed the friends of the Church, and the blame was laid on the Lollards. It was thought that the authorities were too slack in the extirpation of heresy, and in 1406 Parliament petitioned the King to enforce greater strictness in dealing with the Lollards, and a new statute was enacted against them. In 1407 and 1408, councils were held on the subject both at Oxford and in London; and in January, 1409, Archbishop Arundel put forth his famous Constitutions, which, among other things, forbade any translation of the Bible that was not sanctioned by the Bishop of the diocese or by a provincial council, and any discussion of points determined by the Church. The attempt to enforce these orders at Oxford stirred up the old feelings of jealousy with which the University always regarded any interference in its affairs, and the Chancellor of the University, Richard Courtenay,

enlisted the aid of the Prince of Wales in defence of its liberties. In 1411 Archbishop Arundel attempted, amidst great opposition, to hold a visitation of the University. He tried to show that the distinction which the University drew between the teaching of her great son, Wiclif, and the revolutionary principles of the Lollards was not tenable; and he submitted to the Pope no less than two hundred and sixty-seven heresies drawn from Wiclif's own writings, which he asked his Holiness to condemn. This the Pope was ready enough to do, but he would not comply with Arundel's further request, that Wiclif's body should be exhumed and cast on a dunghill.

Various circumstances tended to raise the hopes of the Lollards. Towards the close of 1409 Arundel, their arch-enemy, had resigned his seals as Chancellor of England, and was succeeded by Sir Thomas Beaufort, a son of the Duke of Lancaster by Catherine Swynford, and therefore half-brother of the King. He inherited his father's anti-clerical feelings, and so we are not surprised to learn that in the next Parliament, which met early in 1410, the King was recommended to make a permanent confiscation of the lands of the bishops and the greater abbeys. The introducer of the Bill was Sir John Oldcastle, a noted Lollard, of whom we shall hear more presently. The death of Henry IV. in 1413 would raise the Lollards' hopes still higher, for Henry V.'s conduct when he was Prince of Wales might lead them to suppose that they would not find in him the implacable enemy his father had been. He had been, as we have seen, successfully appealed to by the Chancellor of Oxford to defend the liberties of the University, when the Archbishop desired to make

a raid upon the Lollards there; he had used his best endeavours in favour of the second victim of the *De Hæretico* statute, a poor tailor of Evesham, named John Badby, who was arraigned in 1409 for denying the doctrine of Transubstantiation, and burnt. He had been, and still was, an intimate friend of Sir John Oldcastle, with whom he was associated in the Welsh wars. But, in spite of all this, he proved as determined a foe to Lollardism as his father had been, and within a few months of the commencement of his reign a far more important prosecution than that of Sawtrey or Badby began.

Among the favourers of the Lollards had been men of high reputation in the Court of Richard II. The great Earl of Salisbury had been 'a noted and powerful heretic,'[1] and among their protectors were found the influential names of Latimer, Clifford and Neville. But no one had been so active a propagandist of Lollardism as Sir John Oldcastle, who had been a prominent member of the House of Commons as well as a brave soldier. In 1409 he had been summoned to the Upper House under the title of Lord Cobham in consequence of his marriage with the heiress of the barony of Cobham. He had estates in Herefordshire and Kent, and took advantage of his influence as a landowner to encourage the labours of the Wiclifite priests on his property; but, so far, there had been nothing in his conduct to justify the suspicion that he meditated any sedition. In the Convocation, however, of 1413, Archbishop Arundel declared that the only effectual means of suppressing Lollardism would be by attacking its supporters in high quarters; and the chief offender

[1] Bishop Stubbs, 'Const. Hist.,' iii. 32.

was the King's friend, Sir John Oldcastle, or Lord Cobham.[1] The Convocation, therefore, named him to the King, who argued with him in vain. He was then summoned to appear before the Archbishop and three of his suffragans, but refused to obey two summonses to that effect. He was then arrested, and underwent an examination in which he made a profession of faith, which at an earlier period would certainly have been regarded as quite satisfactory. But Archbishop Arundel provokingly made the whole question to turn upon the comparatively novel dogma of Transubstantiation, which had not been *de fide* for at least twelve hundred years after the rise of Christianity. Lord Cobham declared his full belief in the Real Presence in the Holy Eucharist, but persisted in denying that the elements ceased to exist. He was therefore condemned as a heretic and sent back to the Tower, from whence he speedily made his escape, possibly with the connivance of the Government. It is hardly possible to disconnect his escape with the immediate rising of the Lollards, who assembled in formidable numbers in St. Giles' Fields on January 12, 1414. Happily, there was a strong King upon the throne; otherwise the abortive attempt might easily have assumed the proportions of a serious rebellion. Lord Cobham fled, and was declared an outlaw, but in 1417 he was captured on the Welsh borders, hanged, drawn and quartered as a traitor, and then burnt as a heretic. His history is rather an obscure one, but it appears on the face

[1] His title to nobility seems to have been regarded as rather doubtful; in the proclamation for his apprehension, five years after he had assumed the title of Lord Cobham, he is called Sir John Oldcastle.

of it as if a wrong-headed policy had first made him a dangerous element in the State and then converted him into a martyr.

After the rising in St. Giles' Fields a new statute was enacted by the Parliament assembled at Leicester in 1414, by which the Lollards were not necessarily to be condemned first by the ecclesiastical power, and then handed over to the secular arm, but might be arrested in the first instance by the latter. This was only natural, for the Lollards had now become a political at least as much as a religious party, and were a real danger to the Constitution; but the Church had still too much to do with the persecution of the heretics. In 1416 directions were put forth by Archbishop Chichele for searching out heretics and any who had 'suspected books written in English,' and proceeding against them. The year before the Archbishop had himself presided at the trial of a skinner, called John Claydon, who had caused a book entitled 'The Lantern of Light'[1] to be copied; and the poor man was condemned as a relapsed heretic, handed over to the secular arm, and burnt at Smithfield. The same fate overtook a priest called William Taillour, whom the Archbishop first degraded from the priesthood, and then delivered to be burnt in 1422. The result of such proceedings was, of course, to make the Lollards more and more disaffected; there is no doubt that the rebellion in 1431, known, from the name of its leader, as 'Jack Sharp's,' was a Lollard rebellion; and that under John Mortimer, in 1450,

[1] This book is attributed by some to Wiclif. See Archbishop Trench's 'Mediæval Church History,' p. 312, 'Wiclif's Lantern of Light.'

was probably of the same character. But some time before the latter broke out persecution of the Lollards had almost ceased, to be revived, however, at the commencement of the Tudor dynasty. It is to be feared that its suspension was due, not so much to the prevalence of a more merciful spirit, as to the fact that Englishmen were killing one another with other weapons; for the civil wars of the Roses diverted men's thoughts from heretics, and the sword took the place of the stake.

It would be a great mistake to suppose that in the fifteenth century there were only two religious parties in England—that which favoured, and that which opposed, the Lollards. To say nothing of the strained relations which still existed between the seculars and regulars, and between the friars and both, there was also a party bent upon reforming the Church from within, to whose object the existence of Lollardism must have been the greatest embarrassment. One of the best representatives of this party was Robert Hallam, Bishop of Salisbury, who ably represented its views both at the Council of Pisa, in 1409,[1] and at that of Constance, in 1414.[2] He was sincerely anxious, on the one hand, to preserve the unity of the Church, and, on the other hand, to reform its abuses, and his premature death abroad, in 1417, was a great loss to the Church and nation. Another representative was William Gascoigne, who combined a vehement hostility to the Wiclifites with all Wiclif's ardour

[1] He was accompanied by Henry Chichele, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury.

[2] Clifford, Bishop of London, was the chief representative of the English Church at this council.

against pluralities, non-residence, and the neglect of their duty by the clergy generally; but his valuable life was cut short when he was only forty-four years of age, in 1457. Both these eminent men were closely connected with Oxford, where the desire for reform was curiously mixed up with a determination to maintain the privileges of the University, and where the leaven of Wiclif's teaching still worked among many who could scarcely be termed Lollards.

Again, the party which, ever since the days of King John, had been bitterly opposed to the political encroachments and the insatiable extortions of the Papacy, though in no respect differing from its doctrines, and in no way disputing its spiritual authority, still flourished and made itself felt. This was shown, among other ways, in the determined and successful resistance to the attempt of Pope Martin V. to bestow upon the powerful Bishop of Winchester, Henry Beaufort, the legatine authority for life, which would have placed him virtually above the Archbishop of Canterbury. Archbishop Chichele naturally protested against the arrangement, and Henry V., though an intimate friend of Beaufort, who was his half-uncle and probably his tutor, took, as he always did, the side of the Archbishop. He would not allow Beaufort to accept the office of Cardinal,[1] much less that of Legate *a latere*. But when Henry VI. succeeded Henry V., the Pope, as usual, took advantage of a weak reign to advance the interests of Rome in England. He succeeded in making Beaufort a Cardinal, and in 1426 invested

[1] That is, he would not permit him to retain his bishopric if he accepted the cardinalate.

him with legatine authority while still retaining the bishopric of Winchester. Cardinal Beaufort became the head of the Roman party, which gained ground under a feeble King and an exceptionally strong Pope. Martin V. made persistent efforts to obtain the abrogation of the anti-Papal Statutes of Provisors and Præmunire,[1] and was very indignant because Archbishop Chichele, on whom he cast more than one marked slight,[2] did not second his efforts as he expected him to do. He threatened to put the kingdom under an interdict if the statute were not repealed. Probably the Wars of the Roses, as they stayed the persecution of the Lollards, also stayed a further advance of Rome.

There was one man who stood almost by himself in his attitude alike towards the Papacy, the Lollards, and the National Church. This was Reginald or Raynold Pecock, successively Bishop of S. Asaph and Chichester, whose career forms a curious and almost unique episode in the history of the Church in the fifteenth century. As the Puritans were the legitimate descendants of Wiclif, so were the rationalists and latitudinarians of Pecock. Not that there is any evidence of his having in any way doubted the reality of a Divine revelation in Holy Scripture, but he certainly did apply the principles of rationalism both to the interpretation of Scripture and to

[1] 'The execrable Statute of Præmunire,' as he called it in a missive to Archbishop Chichele. In the same letter he speaks of 'the viper-like penalties of the Statute of Provisors.'

[2] He addressed a mandate to the two metropolitans of England, putting York before Canterbury: 'Martinus Episcopus, servus servorum Dei venerabilibus fratribus Eboracensi et Cantuariensi Archiepiscopus.' This order could hardly have been accidental, tallying as it does with his exaltation of Beaufort above Chichele.

theological and ecclesiastical questions generally. Let his life and writings speak for themselves.

Reginald Pecock was born, probably in Wales, about the year 1390. Like most of the great men of his day, he was educated at Oxford, where he was elected Fellow of Oriel in 1417. In 1420 he was ordained, on the title of his Fellowship, by Dr. Fleming, Bishop of Lincoln, in whose diocese Oxford then was. In 1425 he was summoned to Court by Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester, the Protector of the kingdom and a patron of learned and virtuous men; and in 1431 he was made Master of the College of S. Spirit and S. Mary, which had lately been founded in the city of London by the famous Lord Mayor, Sir Richard Whittington, with the rectory of S. Michael's Church, Riola, attached. Early in 1444 he was promoted by Papal provision to the bishopric of S. Asaph, and in 1447 he preached a famous sermon at Paul's Cross, in which he affirmed seven 'Conclusions,' the gist of which was that bishops were not bound to preach to the common people of their dioceses, 'taking the word *preach* in its most famous signification';[1] that they are superior to other curates, and are obliged to keep themselves free and at liberty from that burden; but that they have authority to resume and take to themselves the office and work of preaching, and that they need not reside in their dioceses.[2]

[1] In this expression, which the Bishop frequently uses, he probably refers to the homely and popular style adopted, first by the friars, and then by their bitterest enemies, the 'poor priests' of Wiclif.

[2] The 'Seven Conclusions' will be found in full in the 'Life of Raynold Pecock,' by John Lewis, pp. 13, 14 (new edition, Oxford, 1820).

The sermon was, of course, directed against the Wiclifites, whose invectives against unpreaching bishops, absentees, and Papal provisions, were the loudest; but it also startled the authorities of the Church, and Bishop Pecock was cited to appear before the Archbishop of Canterbury, when he defended his 'Conclusions' with great ingenuity, and declared his intention of writing a book on the subject. Accordingly, in 1449, the book appeared under the title of 'The Repressour of over-much writing' [blaming] 'the Clergie,' the 'over-blamers' being, as he expressly says, 'the Bible men' or Wiclifites, who not only make Scripture to contain all supernatural and revealed truth (to which he would have agreed), but also hold that 'to do anything according to any other law, is not only unnecessary, but unlawful.' This, he contends, is utterly subversive (1) of reason, (2) of all Church authority. It is curious to observe how he takes the same line against the Wiclifites that Richard Hooker took, two centuries later, against the Puritans, except that he lays more stress on reason and less on Church authority than Hooker would have done, and defends usages of the mediæval Church which Hooker would not have defended. In fact, the whole book was intended to be a defence of the system of the Church in its entirety. But he is in favour of winning over the Lollards by argument rather than of forcing them to recant by persecution—or, at any rate, of trying the former method first. 'The clergy,' he says, 'shall be condemned at the last day, if by cleer will they draw not men into consent of trew faith otherwise than by fier and sword or management, although I will not deny these second means to be

lawful, provided the former be first used.' The book could not have displeased the Pope, for, on the murder of Bishop Moleyns or Molineux in 1449, Bishop Pecock was translated by Papal provision from S. Asaph to Chichester. Soon afterwards he published, with the same object of winning over the Lollards, another work, entitled 'A Treatise of Faith,' in which he anticipates to some extent the arguments of another great divine, Bishop Butler. He maintains that men should 'follow the determinations and the holdings of the Church in matter of faith' unless they can demonstrate them to be wrong; and this leads him into a long digression, in which he argues that faith is only 'probable or opinional, not sciential, which is had in the bliss of heaven,' reminding us slightly of Butler's famous dictum that 'to us probability is the very guide of life.' He holds that the opposition to Wiclif had led the clergy to rate Church authority too high, and that by condemning Wiclif's translation of the Bible they had made this authority higher than that of Scripture itself; he attacks the friars, whom he terms 'pulpit bawlers'; he implicitly condemns the persecution of the Lollards; and he expresses pretty clearly his opinion that many legends were pious frauds.

Such views created alarm. Pecock was preached against, especially at Oxford and Cambridge; and in 1457 he was expelled from the House of Lords, the temporal lords being quite as much incensed against him as the spiritual. One of the grievances against him was that he published his works in English, so that they might be read by the unlearned, who would be most liable to be misled by him.

Writing in English, he naturally quoted the Scriptures in English, and for so doing he was cited before the Primate (Bourchier), and charged with violating the Constitutions of Archbishop Arundel, which, as we have seen, forbade any translation of Holy Scripture into English without the sanction of the diocesan or of a provincial council. As Pecock was himself the Diocesan, this seems a strange charge. The Archbishop's mandate was dated October 22, 1457, and the result of the trial was that the Bishop was required either to recant or to be delivered over to the secular arm as a heretic. He chose the former alternative, and made a public abjuration of his errors, both at Lambeth and at Paul's Cross, under peculiarly humiliating circumstances. By doing so he saved his life, but little else. He was forced to resign his bishopric, and was kept in close confinement in the Abbey of Thorney, where he appears to have been harshly treated, and where he died, probably about the year 1460.

Bishop Pecock's case was a very peculiar one, and it is scarcely fair to accuse him of a want of courage for retracting his opinions, for he always professed himself a true son of the Church; and if so, then surely it was loyalty, not cowardice, on his part, to submit his own judgment to that of his spiritual mother.[1] There is a special interest about him as

[1] It is with great diffidence that I venture to differ from so high an authority as Dean Milman on this point; but surely, if the reader weighs what has been said in the text, he will think the following rather too harsh an estimate of Bishop Pecock's conduct: 'The great intellect of his age, the most powerful theologian in England, disgraced himself by miserable cowardice' ('Annals of S. Paul's Cathedral,' ch. iv., p. 96).

the one solitary instance of 'a rationalist,' in the mediæval Church, and also as the writer of 'the earliest piece of good philosophical disquisition of which our English prose literature can boast.'[1]

It is a relief to turn from controversies and persecutions to those works of 'piety and charity' in which the fifteenth century was peculiarly rich, partly through private liberality, partly through the diversion of monastic foundations to purposes more in accordance with the spirit of the age. Among these a high place must be given to the munificent foundations of Archbishop Chichele, whose name has hitherto come before us only in connection with disputes, on the one side with the Papacy, on the other with the Lollards. Henry Chichele was of humble birth, but, instead of being ashamed of his extraction, he had the good sense to recognise the means by which he had risen so high above his station, and to show his gratitude by providing the same means for others—that is, by spending his money to further the education of poor scholars, first at his native place, and then at the University where he had received his own education. He was born about 1362, at Higham Ferrers, then a flourishing, but now a decayed—though interesting and picturesque—little town in Northants; and Higham Ferrers was the first place that profited by his liberality. Hs founded there, about 1422, a college for eight secular priests, who were to engage in the work of tuition; and also a hospital for twelve poor men. He left traces of his munificence both at Canterbury and at Lambeth; but the scene of his greatest benefactions was Oxford. He first established a

[1] Churchill Babington's introduction to 'The Repressour,' etc.

fund known as 'Chichele's Chest,' or 'Chichele's Hatch,' from which the University might borrow money to meet the wants of poor students. He then determined to found a college, and, in the first instance, erected a small building in St. Giles', called S. Bernard's College, which was, however, handed over before its completion to the Cistercians, and remained in their possession till the Reformation, when it became the nucleus round which S. John's was built. But, being a secular himself, he determined that his great work should be the foundation of a secular college, the first stone of which was laid in February, 1438. Hence arose the noble foundation of All Souls', for '40 poor and indigent scholars, clerks,' who, as the name of the college might remind them, were to devote themselves, not only to learning, but to prayer. They were 'to pray for Henry V., the Duke of Clarence, those who had perished in the war with France, and for the souls of all the faithful defunct.' He erected buildings on a grand scale, and endowed it with lands which he bought from the Crown, and which had belonged to the now suppressed alien priories.[1]

A still more extensive work was the foundation by Henry VI. of his twin colleges, 'the King's College of Our Lady at Eton beside Windsor,' and 'the King's College of Our Lady and St. Nicholas at Cambridge.' Both were framed avowedly on the

[1] Mr. J. B. Mullinger says ('University of Cambridge,' i. 305) that no less than 122 priories were confiscated under the direction of Archbishop Chichele, and their revenues, for the time, absorbed in the royal exchequer. Chichele seems to have purchased from the Crown the revenues of some for the foundation of All Souls', while the rest were employed without purchase for the foundation of Eton and King's.

plan of William of Wykeham at Winchester and Oxford, but on a larger scale. Henry not only projected, but actually began to put his project into execution, at Eton, in 1439, when he was yet a boy himself, by purchasing the advowson of the parish church; and in 1440 he issued the charter, extending it into a college under a Provost and Fellows, with a school and almshouse attached. In 1441 the charter was issued and the foundation-stone laid for the Cambridge college, which was intended to be on an even more magnificent scale than it is. Henry VI., though weak in intellect himself, was a munificent patron of learning in others, and there is no doubt that he was the instigator of another royal foundation at Cambridge, in 1448—that of 'the College of the two Queens,' Margaret of Anjou, his own wife, being the first foundress. He himself was educated at Oxford, and it is said that William of Waynflete, who had great influence over him, endeavoured to persuade him to erect a college there, but the King replied: 'Nay, rather at Cambridge, that so I may have, if it can be done, two Universities in my kingdom.'[1]

What William of Waynflete could not persuade the King to do, he did himself; and hence arose the splendid foundations of Magdalen College, Magdalen School, and, we may add, virtually Magdalen Hall. There is a peculiar interest about these foundations for more reasons than one. In the first place, Magdalen College is the most beautiful of all the architectural sisters. The view which met the

[1] 'Immò potius Cantabrigiæ, ut ita duas, si fieri possit, in regno academias habeam.' See Dr. Chandler's 'Life of Bishop William Waynflete,' p. 48.

traveller's eye in the old days, as he approached Oxford by the London road, embracing the exquisite tower of Magdalen and its buildings and its park, on the banks of the Cherwell, spanned by the Magdalen bridge, was unique. It was also the most sumptuous and elaborate foundation that had yet been erected. 'Uncommon, perhaps unparalleled,' writes his biographer,[1] 'was the liberality displayed by Waynflete in the endowment of his college, and in the assignment of necessaries of every kind for his society.' 'I think,' writes Anthony Wood, 'it exceedeth any foundation for secular scholars in Europe.' Again, the time of its foundation rendered it the more remarkable. It was in the midst of the Wars of the Roses, when men's minds were turned in quite a different direction from that of the quiet cloister; and, curiously enough, its founder was not one who stood apart from the din of war and politics, but a warm partisan of the House of Lancaster. 'It was much,' writes Fuller,[2] 'that in the midst of so many miseries of civil wars, Waynflete should found his fair college,' and 'hee would have done much more then hee did, had hee not bene hindred by the warrs betwene Yorke and Lancaster.'[3] And finally, the character of the founder seems to have been a singularly lovable one. He was a bright light in a dark age, and this circumstance adds a fresh interest to his foundation. There is some little obscurity about the early history of William Waynflete—so called by himself from the place of

[1] Chandler's 'Life of William Waynflete,' p. 209.

[2] 'Church History,' book iv., p. 188.

[3] Quoted by Dr. Chandler (p. 211) from MSS. Ashmol., No. 810.

his birth, but really the son of William Patten, alias Barbour, of Waynflete. It is pretty certain, however, that he was educated at Winchester and Oxford, and quite certain that in 1440 he became headmaster of Wykeham's college at Winchester; that in 1442 he was made Master, and in 1443 Provost, of Eton, by Henry VI.; that in 1447 he rose, through the same influence, to the bishopric of Winchester; that he was Chancellor of England from 1456 to 1460; and that he died, full of years and honours, August 11, 1486. His experience at Winchester and Eton might well fire him with an ambition to do something for a seat of learning which had been the glory of the land, but had now sunk so low that the once rival University of Paris had severed all connection with it as 'no longer worthy of notice.'[1] And so, in 1448, immediately after his appointment to the bishopric, and before his installation, he obtained a royal grant, 'impowering him to found a hall, to be called after the blessed St. Mary Magdalen, for the study of divinity and philosophy, at Oxford; to consist of a president and fifty poor scholars, graduates, the number to be augmented or diminished in proportion to their revenues,' etc.[2] In 1456 he obtained a royal grant to found a college, and in 1458 the society of the hall was merged in that of the college. The buildings as now standing were not erected until some years later. The foundation-stone of the college was 'sanctified by the Bishop of St. David's,' May 5, 1474, and the tower, the most conspicuous feature, was completed about 1479. Benefactions flowed in from many sources, but the life and soul of the whole undertaking was Bishop

[1] See Chandler, p. 45. [2] See Chandler, p. 49.

Waynflete. 'The society was finally fixed to consist of a president, forty scholars [that is, Fellows], clerks, thirty scholars called demys, four presbyters, chaplains, eight clerks, and sixteen choristers, besides servants and other dependents.' The chapel and the chapel services were most important elements in the Bishop's scheme, and a knowledge of music or 'the plain chant' was essential in all scholars, the purpose of the foundation being 'for the maintenance and exaltation of the Christian faith, for the profit of the Church, and for the augmentation of Divine worship, and of the liberal arts, sciences, and faculties.'[1] Besides his college, Waynflete built a grammar-school in connection with it, and under the shadow of its walls; and finally, like Chichele, he did not forget his native place. In 1484 he erected a school and a chapel at Waynflete [Waynfleet], being 'desirous,' we are told, 'by planting grammar learning in the place of his nativity, to extend it in the Northern provinces of the kingdom.'[2] He lived just long enough to see the commencement of a peaceful period, more conducive to study than the troubled times of civil war, in which his various projects had been carried out.

A Lincoln College man must not forget a much humbler foundation than that of Magdalen, which belongs to this period, viz., the 'Collegium Beatæ Virginis Mariæ et Omnium Sanctorum Lincolniense,' which was commenced by one Bishop of Lincoln (Richard Fleming) in 1427, for the express purpose of furnishing an antidote through 'a college of priests' to the doctrines of the Lollards, and largely augmented by another Bishop of Lincoln

[1] See 'Lib. Statut.,' *in initio*. [2] Chandler, p. 170.

(Thomas Rotheram, afterwards Archbishop of York) in 1479.

Many more instances might be given, but the above will suffice to show that the period before us was one of great liberality in works of piety and charity, though not, perhaps, so exceptionally great as might at first sight appear. From what has been said, it will be noticed that the munificence had now been directed into a new channel. The foundation of colleges instead of monasteries,[1] with the appropriation of monastic revenues for the purpose, was partly a symptom, but partly also a cause, of the favour with which the 'seculars' and the disfavour with which the 'regulars' were regarded. From the times of Walter de Merton at Oxford and Hugh Balsham at Cambridge downwards, the successive colleges which were founded at each University were certainly intended to be seminaries of the Church, as well as seats of learning; but their object was distinctly to educate 'seculars,' not 'regulars'—in other words, to make good parish priests, not good monks.

[1] For proofs and illustrations of this fact, see Canon Dixon's 'History of the Church of England,' i., p. 319, etc.

CHAPTER XI.

THE RENAISSANCE.

Causes of a check of anti-Papal feeling—Weakness of Church during Wars of Roses—Accession of Henry VII.: a new era—Archbishop Morton—Laity better educated—Cry for reform from clergy and laity—Revival of Lollardism among the uncultured—'Revival of learning'—Sack of Constantinople and spread of Greek literature—Italy a stronghold of the Renaissance—Rage for classical studies—Caxton and Aldus, apostles of the Renaissance—Movement at Oxford—Decay of scholasticism—New methods of studying Holy Scripture and the early Fathers—William Sellynge—William Grocyn—Sir Thomas More—William Lilly—Thomas Linacre—William Latimer—Desiderius Erasmus—Patrons of the new learning—William Warham—Thomas Wolsey—Richard Foxe, founder of Corpus Christi College, Oxford—John Fisher—Margaret, Countess of Richmond—Foundation of St. John's and of Christ's Colleges, Cambridge—Importance of the Renaissance movement.

'If any man will look down along the line of early English history, he will see a standing contest between the rulers of the land and the Bishop of Rome. The Crown and Church of England with a steady opposition resisted the entrance and encroachment of the secularized ecclesiastical power of the Pope in England. The last rejection of it was no more than a successful effort after many a failure in struggles of the like kind.'

Thus wrote the late Cardinal Manning[1] before he

[1] 'Unity of the Church,' p. 36.

had yet renounced the Church of his baptism; and the preceding pages will have been written in vain if the reader does not at once recognise the absolute truth of his assertions.

But in the fifteenth century the strong anti-Papal feeling in England had received a check from various quarters. In the first place, the abortive attempts of the three great councils—Pisa, 1409; Constance, 1414; Basle, 1431—to stimulate reform, and to assert the principle that the authority of general councils was greater than that of the Pope, had naturally produced the opposite effect to that which was intended, for nothing tends more to strengthen a cause than ineffectual attempts to weaken it. An exceptionally strong and persistent Pope, Martin V. took advantage of the opportunity to push the Papal claims forward in England as they had not been pushed for many a long day. Then the Wars of the Roses had diverted men's attention from ecclesiastical affairs, and during the continuance of these wars the resistance to Rome was far less vigorous and general than it had been a century before. The House of Lancaster, which had been predominant for the greater part of the time, was eminently religious, and its religious sympathies were always in the direction of Rome. Whatever there was of anti-Roman feeling was on the side of the Yorkists, not of the Lancastrians. Again, the spread of Lollardism unquestionably brought about a reaction in the opposite extreme. Churchmen felt that they must be careful lest, in shunning the Scylla of Roman subjection, they should fall into the Charybdis of Lollard lawlessness.

But with the accession of Henry VII. in 1485 a new era set in. Men's minds were no longer pre-

occupied with war, and they were able to turn their attention to ecclesiastical affairs. The result of such attention necessarily led to a sense of the urgent need of reform. For the Church of England had reached its nadir in the times of the Wars of the Roses; it had almost ceased to be a power in the land, it had no mission for anybody. There were still, of course, great and good men in it, some of whom have been already noticed; but its general level was very low. Abuses which had been complained of for centuries flourished now more than ever, in the rankest luxuriance. Pluralities, and the consequent non-residence of bishops in their dioceses[1] and of parochial clergy in their parishes, had reached such a pitch that they had become intolerable. Even good men thought it no shame to accept preferments to the duties of which they could not possibly attend. Benefices were heaped upon youths who were under the canonical age, and had not been admitted even into the minor Orders of the ministry; and, with some notable exceptions, these favoured individuals made no compensation for the irregularity by any peculiar merits, moral or intellectual. Thomas Gascoigne, writing at various times between 1434 and 1457, gives a most melancholy picture of the pluralities, non-residence, and general neglect of their duties by the clergy of his day;[2] and as Gascoigne held the

[1] It was quite a common thing for the necessary episcopal work of a diocese to be done by a Bishop *in partibus*, while the real Bishop of the diocese was far away.

[2] See his 'Dictionarium Theologicum sive Veritates Collectæ ex s. Scripturâ et aliorum Sanctorum Scriptis, in modum Tabulæ Alphabeticæ.' Some extracts from this book were republished by Professor J. E. T. Rogers under the title of 'Loci e Libro Veritatum,' 1881; 'Seven Streams of Babylon' (that is, 'Seven Clerical Abuses'), *passim*.

responsible position of Chancellor of the University of Oxford, being elected to it annually for many years, he would hardly write without measuring his words. As the century advanced matters certainly did not mend, but rather grew worse.

And if the secular clergy had fallen to a low estate, the regulars had sunk lower still. The monastic system in England had virtually collapsed long before the dissolution of the monasteries. Not only were there few, if any, new monasteries founded, but there was a decided tendency to divert the existing institutions into educational establishments; and when any inclination was shown to strengthen the monastic system it was generally checked. The case of the friars was even worse than that of the regular monks. In England, at any rate, they had degenerated from a great power into a by-word and a reproach. The Church had revived a little under the able conduct of Cardinal Morton, Archbishop of Canterbury and Lord Chancellor, who, by the way, was one of the earliest and most eager of reformers before the Reformation; but Morton himself was more of a statesman than a Churchman, and the readiness which he showed in lending himself to the avaricious schemes of Henry VII. did not at all tend to increase his spiritual authority. Morton was, however, entirely free from the vice which stained the character of his royal master. He was a most munificent prelate, and the great respect in which he was held by Sir Thomas More, who in his youth was a member of the Archbishop's household, is of itself a sufficient proof of his merits. If he was not a saint himself, he at any rate had a due appreciation of saintliness in others, for it was through his

efforts that S. Anselm was at last canonized. If this were a history of England, and not merely of the Church of England, a far larger space would have to be given to this very able man, who was practically the founder of the Tudor dynasty. But as a Churchman he cannot claim a longer notice.[1]

The Church at the beginning of the sixteenth century was weak in all her departments, and in those critical times she could ill afford to be so. For a variety of circumstances would have made it hard for her to hold her own, even if her internal condition had been thoroughly satisfactory. There was a growing jealousy of clerical interference in State affairs. The time had passed when the superior education of the clergy rendered it absolutely necessary for them to take a leading part in the business of the nation, as the only persons competent to conduct it successfully. The laity were becoming educated, and they thought, rightly enough, that the clergy had better leave *them* to manage secular affairs, and devote themselves exclusively to their own proper work. The same intellectual advance led the laity to take a higher standard of clerical work, and the abuses of the ecclesiastical courts, clerical scandals, and clerical negligence, were the subjects of perpetual complaint.

It must not, however, be supposed that the cry for Church reform was exclusively, or even chiefly, a lay cry; it came from all quarters, and from none more loudly than from the higher clergy themselves, such as Morton, Warham, Wolsey, and Foxe. There

[1] For an account of this very able prelate, see the recently published 'Life of Archbishop Morton,' by the Rev. R. J. Woodhouse.

were two distinct parties, who differed in other respects as widely as possible from each other, but were agreed in a desire for the reform of the Church.

First, there was the old party of the Lollards, which revived greatly at the close of the fifteenth and the beginning of the sixteenth century. The persecution of them also revived, and, as usual, persecution only tended to strengthen their cause. On the principle that if you throw plenty of mud some of it will stick, no doubt the invectives of the Lollards against Church abuses had something to do with the general cry for reform; but it is strange how very few men of any kind of eminence identified themselves with the Lollard party. Wiclif himself was a man of high mark—in fact, the first scholar of his age, but scarcely any of his followers rose from obscurity. Lollardism was essentially the religion of the uncultured, and its influence was greatly lessened in consequence. But the spirit of reform was awakened at the very opposite pole, so far as culture and refinement went, to that of Lollardism. For some time various circumstances had been preparing the way for that movement which is called vaguely 'the revival of learning.' Everything was prepared for the reception of the new ideas when a new intellectual world was opened by the sacking of Constantinople by the Turks in 1453, and the consequent migration of Greeks, with their priceless treasures of ancient Greek literature, into Western Christendom.[1] Italy was the stronghold of the

[1] Mr. Gardiner (a very high authority) says that the Renaissance sprang up in Italy, and received a further impulse in 1453 (Students' 'History of England,' p. 366); but for practical purposes 1453 may be taken as the date of the general movement.

Renaissance; the Pope himself, Nicholas V., became its patron, and thereby, as Gibbon says, 'sharpened those weapons which were soon to be used against the Roman Church.' Thence it spread into other countries, notably, though slowly, into England. Classical tastes and classical ideas became rife in all departments; in the fine arts, in literature, in the education of the young, and, what is most to our present purpose, in the sphere of religion. There was practically an attempt made to Christianize classicism and to classicize Christianity;[1] Plato and Christ were supposed to be essentially in agreement; the barbarous Latin of the schoolmen was as much despised as their method of argument; a wider view of life was to be taken, and those who took it were called humanists, because they acted on the Terentian principle, 'Homo sum; nihil humani a me alienum puto.'[2] The invention of printing with movable types greatly conduced both to the spread and the deepening of the new ideas; our own Caxton, and in a far greater degree the famous Venetian printer, Minucius Aldus, were in a very real sense apostles of the Renaissance. There was a rage for classical studies, and some pious

[1] Dr. Fowler gives an amusing instance in his 'History of Corpus Christi College, Oxford,' of the strange blending of heathenism and Christianity; he quotes the following couplet from John Shepreve's almost contemporary 'Life of John Claymond,' the first President of C. C. C., written in Latin elegiacs:

'Hunc tamen ipse dolet Phœbus, Phœbique sorores,
Hunc *Mariâque satus* (!) Diique Deæque doleat.'

[2] Mr. Walter Pater is of opinion that 'the essence of humanism is that nothing which has ever interested living men and women can wholly lose its vitality' ('Studies in the History of the Renaissance,' p. 38).

Christians seem actually to have feared lest there might be a return to the gods of Greece and Rome. That was not likely to happen: but there was a real danger lest, in the unsettled state of men's minds, and their general dissatisfaction with the existing condition of the Church, a sceptical spirit should prevail. In fact, a wave of scepticism *did* pass over Italy, and in a less virulent form over England. The Pope himself, Leo X., did not escape the infection. Sceptical or semi-sceptical conversation became fashionable, and though the fashion soon passed away, the residuum which it left behind was a stronger conviction than ever that the Church *must* be reformed if it was to hold its own against the new spirit that had arisen.

Hence arose the class of reformers who identified themselves more or less with the Renaissance; and in this class were found some of the most learned and distinguished men then living. An interesting little coterie, of which Oxford was the chief centre, for some time worked together in the cause. It included William Grocyn, John Colet, Thomas More, Thomas Linacre, William Lilly, and William Latimer. Erasmus was a frequent visitor, and a trusted friend of all; Warham, Archbishop of Canterbury, was a valued patron and protector; and Cardinal Wolsey, Bishop Foxe of Winchester, and King Henry VIII. himself, were to a very great extent in sympathy with them. It was the aim of all to encourage 'the new learning,'[1] especially the study of Greek, and to apply its principles to theology. They were all in favour of abandoning the old scholastic *a priori* method of studying the Holy Scriptures, and

[1] Hence they were called 'the men of the new learning.'

of interpreting them in their literal, grammatical sense like any other book; they were all bent upon a return to the early Fathers[1] and primitive antiquity in place of mediæval traditions; they were all desirous of a reform, not so much of the doctrines of the Church[2] (though some, at any rate, of them would not have left all these entirely untouched), as of the lives of the clergy; but they differed widely as to the prominence they gave to theological and ecclesiastical questions. A short sketch of the careers and sentiments of the principal members of this band will best bring out these points.

In one sense, William Sellynge, or Selling, Fellow of All Souls', was at least a precursor of the band. In 1480 he became a student of Greek at Bologna, and it was he who introduced Linacre (his pupil) to Politian. But he was not so much connected with Oxford as with Canterbury, having become Prior of the monastery of Christ Church in that city, to which he presented some valuable Greek and Latin manuscripts.[3] He can hardly be called a member of the coterie, the chief member of which was *William Grocyn* (? 1446-1519), a name which will now, it is

[1] A knowledge of Greek, of course, introduced them to some of the best of the early Fathers.

[2] Mr. Seebohm, in his most interesting volume on 'The Oxford Reformers,' seems to me to state their divergence from the doctrines—or, rather, their willingness to tolerate such divergences—too strongly. I had written this note before Mr. Hutton had published his monograph on Sir Thomas More, and am thankful to find I have so good an authority on my side. See p. 186, *et seq.*

[3] On his tomb at Canterbury Cathedral he is described as: 'Doctor theologus Selling Græcâ atque Latinâ Linguâ perdoctus.' For a further account of him, see Mullinger's 'University of Cambridge,' vol. i., pp. 477, 478.

hoped, be rescued from the obscurity into which it had undeservedly fallen. An excellent memoir is attached by Professor Montagu Burrows to the catalogue of Grocyn's library discovered in 1889 among the archives of Merton College, and published by the Oxford Historical Society.[1] In his own day Grocyn was regarded as, in one sense, the head of the band. Erasmus declares that he held 'the first place among the many learned men in Britain,' and calls him 'the patron and preceptor of us all.' George Lilly (the son of William Lilly, who will be noticed presently), says that Grocyn was the first to introduce the rudiments of the Greek and Latin tongues into Britain,[2]—an amusing instance of the way in which the classicists regarded the mediæval Latin as of no account and beneath contempt. Stapleton, in his 'Life of Sir T. More,' a little later (1588), writes that Grocyn was 'the first man of his age to introduce Greek literature into England, and to profess it publicly at Oxford,'[3] and Dr. Hallam characterizes him as 'the patriarch of English learning.' Professor Burrows, therefore, does not claim too much for his hero when he affirms that 'to no man was the preparation for the English Renaissance by means of the new learning more due.' William Grocyn was an Oxford man, connected with three colleges: New, Magdalen, and Exeter; but New College may fairly claim him as her own, for he was a Wykehamist, and a Fellow of New

[1] See the volume entitled 'Collectanea,' second series.

[2] 'Virorum aliquot in Britanniâ qui nostro sæculo eruditione et doctrinâ clari memorabilesque fuerunt Elogia per Georgium Lilium Britannum exarata.'

[3] See 'Tres Thomæ'; 'Vita T. Mori,' p. 12.

College, and held a New College living — Newton Longueville in Bucks. Like most of the band, he visited Italy in order to study under the Greeks who had settled there, and on his return to Oxford he lectured in Greek, having among his hearers some of the most eminent scholars of their day. He also represented what may be called the religious side of the Renaissance movement, as well as the scholastic. In the absence of Colet, More took Grocyn as his spiritual director. 'I pass,' he writes to Colet, 'my time with Grocyn, Linacre, and Lilly, the first, as you know, the director of my life in your absence, the second the master of my studies, and the third my most dear companion.' It is strange that so leading a man as Grocyn should have passed into comparative oblivion.

Far otherwise was it with the next on our list. The name of *John Colet* (1467-1519) is still a household word. He had much more decided views and was more outspoken on the subject of Church reform than any of the band: and it can scarcely be said that he desired no change in the doctrines of the mediæval Church, for he distinctly disapproved of image-worship, and expressed to his friend Erasmus doubts about the efficacy of the relics at the tomb of S. Thomas of Canterbury. He appears also to have been in favour of translating the Holy Scriptures into the vernacular, and he warmly approved of Erasmus' Latin version and paraphrases of the New Testament. His lectures at Oxford on the Epistles to the Romans and to the Corinthians, which commenced in 1496, produced a vast sensation,[1] and it is

[1] The more so as he was not yet in deacon's Orders, and was a simple M.A. without any degree in theology. Besides the

almost needless to say that his method of interpretation was that of the new learning, not that of the schoolmen, for he had studied in Italy. Colet had also a wider scope for the dissemination of his views than any of the rest had; for in 1503 he was appointed, through the influence of his constant friend, Archbishop Warham, to the deanery of St. Paul's, and he took advantage of his position to spread in the Metropolis, by resuming his lectures, by preaching, and by other ways, the same sentiments which he had expressed in the narrower circle of Oxford. He was thereby brought into inevitable collision with his Diocesan, for the Bishop of London, Dr. Fitzjames, was one of the chief leaders of what may be called the conservative party in the Church, and was thereby bitterly opposed to the new learning. The Bishop was now quite an old man, and it must be confessed that the Dean showed questionable taste when he ridiculed his habit of reading his sermons (for Colet, like the later reformers, was in favour of preaching without a manuscript). This added a personal element to the disagreement between the two dignitaries. The Bishop charged Colet with heresy before the Archbishop of Canterbury, but Warham, of course, supported his friend and nominee, and dismissed the charges as frivolous. Just before this he had appointed Colet preacher at the opening of Convocation in 1511-12, and

lectures on S. Paul's Epistles, he also lectured on the Book of Genesis, 'treating the first chapter as a noble poem, designed by its author, Moses, to impress upon a rude and barbarous people the great truths of the creation of the world by one Omnific God' (Dean Milman, 'Annals of S. Paul's Cathedral,' ch. vi., p. 115).

Colet's vigorous sermon on that occasion really seemed to sound the keynote of the Reformation which was soon to follow. He boldly rebuked the worldliness, the luxury, the fondness for sports, and the neglect of their duty, both in bishops and clergy, and pleaded in the strongest terms for an internal reform of the Church. Colet always had in the highest degree the courage of his opinions. In his sermon at the installation of Wolsey as Cardinal in Westminster Abbey in 1515, he had no scruple about warning the new Cardinal against worldly ambition —a delicate subject to handle on such an occasion. He set his face steadily against the war policy of King Henry VIII. It was not only a delicate but a dangerous matter to thwart the will of the tyrannical monarch; but Henry, to his credit be it related, not only forgave Colet's boldness, but rewarded it by making him a royal chaplain. Even in the noble foundation of S. Paul's School, which has immortalized Colet's name, his anti-ecclesiastical bias is apparent; for he appointed the Mercers' Company, and not any ecclesiastical corporation, to be the governing body, and that in spite of the fact that schools attached to cathedrals were almost always under the care and control of the cathedral chapters, S. Paul's being a notable exception. What course he would have taken had his life been spared to see the Reformation proper can only be a matter of conjecture. It may be that he would have ranged himself with More and Fisher, for he gives us no hint that he ever desired more than an internal reform of the Church by the Church itself; had he desired more, he would probably have said so, for he was the last man in the world to conceal his opinions, what-

ever they might be. But though he was unquestionably a child of the Renaissance, not of the Reformation, he appears to me to have had more in common with the latter, especially in his spirit and tone of mind, than any of the rest who belonged to the earlier movement.

Among those who were deeply influenced by the vigorous and outspoken teaching of Colet was one who afterwards became one of the most interesting and distinguished men of his day. *Sir Thomas More* (1478-1535) took Colet for his confessor, and made him, as he himself tells us, 'the director of his life.' But before this he had already been greatly attracted by the new learning. Brought up in the same school where John Colet and William Latimer had been educated (S. Anthony's, Threadneedle Street), and then in the household of Archbishop Morton, a reforming prelate, he must have been ripe for receiving the new influence when he went to Oxford. He there began at once to learn Greek under William Grocyn, and he also made the acquaintance of Thomas Linacre. Indeed, he threw himself into the new movement so heartily that after two years his father removed him from Oxford, either fearing that his devotion to the new learning might affect his orthodoxy, or thinking that the study of Greek would be of no use to him as a lawyer.[1] The alarm was quite unnecessary. Indeed, the fear was quite the other way; there was a great danger lest what

[1] This is Mr. Hutton's view ('Sir Thomas More,' p. 18); Drummond thinks that the reason of his removal was his father's dread of his imbibing heresy ('Erasmus,' i. 69). Stapleton writes: 'His father left him without any means for the study of Greek and of philosophy, so as to compel him to the study of law' ('Tres Thomæ').

would have been called in the eighteenth century his 'enthusiasm' should injure his activity as a citizen. He did not lose sight of his Oxford friends, for we find him lecturing on S. Augustine's 'De Civitate Dei' in the church of S. Lawrence, Jewry, of which Grocyn was now Rector; but he spent four years (1499-1503) chiefly in religious contemplation, under the spiritual direction of his friend Colet; taking up his residence near the Charterhouse that he might have the benefit of the services of the Carthusians; devoting himself, as Erasmus tells us, to 'vigils, fasts and prayers, and similar austerities,' the austerities including the wearing of a hair shirt next his skin, scourging himself, and allowing himself only four or five hours of sleep. He also had serious thoughts of becoming a Franciscan friar. Happily, this frame of mind passed away, for a man of such varied accomplishments—scholar, lawyer, divine, statesman, littérateur and wit, and so admirable in every relation of life (model son, husband and father)—could do much more efficient service to religion by living *in* the world, though not *of* the world, than he could have done by going *out* of the world. He became, as is well known, the ablest of lawyers and statesmen, but he never lost his interest in theology, and he never swerved in his adherence to the new learning. The intimate friendship he contracted with Erasmus, who was a frequent visitor in his house, fostered these tastes. The suicidal policy of attempting to crush the study of Greek, the language of the New Testament, appeared to the enlightened mind of Sir Thomas More, as indeed it was, fatal to the best interests of the Church, and he threw himself heart and soul into the new movement both for study

and for reform. He did not, indeed, make war against the corruptions of the age with the savage earnestness of Colet—it was not in his nature to do so; but he directed against them the lighter, but not perhaps less effectual, artillery of his raillery and wit; and so he must be regarded as one of the most valuable members, as he was certainly *the* most distinguished of that little band which all unconsciously paved the way for the Reformation. It is not in the least inconsistent with this attitude that with the Reformation itself, when it came, he had no sympathy whatever,[1] but cheerfully laid his head on the block rather than yield to what was then thought (though erroneously) one of its principles. This, however, will appear later.

For the remaining members of the group a short notice will suffice. *William Lilly* (1468-1522) was the godson of Grocyn, and was sent to Magdalen College, Oxford, where his godfather was Reader in Divinity. Like the rest, Lilly went to Italy, to study the classics, especially Greek, and afterwards taught the new learning in London, where he lived on terms of the closest intimacy with Sir Thomas More. When Colet founded his new school of S. Paul's he made Lilly the first high-master. In that capacity he published his well-known Latin grammar, which afterwards developed into that called 'King Edward the Sixth's'; but this has no bearing upon our subject. *Thomas Linacre* (1460-1524) would, from his general reputation, ill deserve to be so curtly dismissed as he must here be; but his

[1] 'It was to the union between the Church and the new learning that he looked for the great hope of the future.'—Hutton, p. 142.

fame rested chiefly upon merits which are foreign to the Renaissance. He was the most noted physician of his day, and the chief founder and first President of the English College of Physicians. But he was also a distinguished classical scholar, and by his great name, as well as by his personal exertions, he gave a strong impetus to the advance of the new learning. He, too, was an Oxford man, being a Fellow of All Souls', and he lectured at Oxford on Greek, when Sir Thomas More and Erasmus were among his pupils; but he had studied at both the English Universities, and established in each a professorship of Greek. He had also followed the usual course of visiting Italy, where he studied in various centres of the new movement. He had a unique opportunity of disseminating his views in high quarters, by being appointed tutor to Prince Arthur, the eldest son of King Henry VII., and for twenty years he fulfilled the same office to the Princess Mary, eldest daughter to Henry VIII. His various literary works hardly come within our purview; nor does he appear to have taken any leading personal part in theological or ecclesiastical questions. But he thoroughly identified himself with the Renaissance movement, and was the honoured friend of all who have been mentioned in connection with it; and his very high repute added a lustre to the cause. *William Latimer* (? 1460-1545), another Oxford man, a Fellow of All Souls', had an extraordinary reputation in his day both for piety and classical learning. He 'became most eminent, and was worthily numbered among the lights of learning of his time by John Leland.'[1] He seems to have thrown himself more into the theological

[1] 'Encomia,' pp. 18, 74.

side of the new movement than either Lilly or Linacre did, and he was quite one of the central figures of the group we are depicting, being known as 'the pious Latimer'; but his name has fallen into oblivion, or is known chiefly from his having been tutor to Reginald Pole, afterwards Cardinal and Archbishop of Canterbury.

There were, of course, other adherents of the new learning, such as John Clement, of Corpus Christi College, the first English Professor of Greek at Oxford; John Claymond, the first President of Corpus; Richard Pace, of Queen's College, another of the Padua students, afterwards Dean of S. Paul's;[1] but space forbids a detailed account of them.

There was, however, one who, though a foreigner by birth, and only an occasional visitor in England, was yet the most important and influential member of all the band, and therefore demands a fuller notice. This was the famous *Desiderius Erasmus* (1467-1536),[2] who first visited England about the year 1497, and at once recognised spirits congenial to his own in the Oxford group. As his chief object in coming was to learn Greek, he of course made his way to the University, where there were at any rate some attempts being made to pursue the new study. During his two years' stay he formed a lasting friendship with most of the men mentioned

[1] Dr. Pace rose to such eminence that Cardinal Wolsey is said to have done him the honour of being jealous of him, as one not unlikely to supplant him in the royal favour. This is immortalized by Shakespeare, 'Henry VIII.,' Act II., Scene 2.

[2] For a full account of this most interesting man see Canon Pennington's 'Life of Erasmus.'

above, a friendship which he renewed and strengthened on a second and longer visit to England in 1505. It was then that he wrote, at the house of his friend Sir Thomas More, his famous 'Encomium Moriæ,' which, by its lively and pointed satire of ecclesiastics, and especially of monks and friars, did more to undermine the ancient, or, rather, the mediæval, system than any other work that had yet appeared. Erasmus gives in his correspondence a most rosy-coloured picture of England, which he ranks as second to Italy alone in learning and enlightenment, and it is from his pages that we derive the most vivid of all the portraits of the men of the new learning. He prepared the way for the Reformation more than any other man. His 'Latin translation of the New Testament,' and his edition of the text in the original Greek, 'for the first time from manuscripts,' were of incalculable importance in their day.[1] Of course his text has long been superseded by the discovery of fresh manuscripts; but he established a principle which cut at the root of mediævalism, the principle that it is not only allowable, but the bounden duty of the enlightened Christian, to study for himself the *ipsissima verba* of the Divine Word. 'He is not,' he writes, in his preface to the second edition of the Greek Testament, 'a Platonist, who does not read the works of Plato; is he a theologian, not to say a Christian, who does not read the written words of Christ?' His annotations on the New Testament were, in a sense, authorized by the English Church. His 'Colloquies' (1522) follow very much the same line as his earlier 'Encomium Moriæ' (1510), and,

[1] Sir T. More says of it, 'Nova Christi lex nova luce nitet.'

indeed, all his writings, whether they are directly concerned with the Church or not, tend to the same end; and as Erasmus stood on the vantage-ground of having gained the ear of the public, his words came with wonderful effect. It is hardly fair to accuse this great scholar of not having the courage of his opinions because he drew back from the later development of Reformation principles; for though it may be true that he 'laid the egg which Luther hatched,' it is equally true that the full-fledged bird, when it appeared, was quite different from what its parent expected or intended it to be. No doubt Erasmus was not a man of the stuff of which martyrs are made; he frankly admits as much in a letter to the Dean of S. Paul's;[1] but it is peculiarly unreasonable to expect a man to be a martyr for a cause with which he is not in full sympathy; and this was assuredly the case with Erasmus. He belongs to the Renaissance, not to the Reformation, and by the standard of the Renaissance, not by that of the Reformation, he ought to be judged.

Among the patrons of the new movement may be reckoned both the archbishops. William Warham, Archbishop of Canterbury, was a personal friend of most of the members of the group; and on more than one occasion he used the commanding influence which his high position gave him both to protect their persons and to promote their cause. He was sincerely desirous of a reform in the Church,

[1] 'Even if Luther had spoken everything in the most unobjectionable manner, I had no inclination to die for the sake of truth. Every man has not the courage to make a martyr; and I am afraid, if I were put to the trial, I should imitate S. Peter.'

and took some steps to bring it about; but, like the rest, he meant by reform only a reform of the lives of the clergy. As a staunch and consistent patron of the new learning, he deserved and won the lasting gratitude of the little band who were devoting themselves to its extension. Erasmus is so enthusiastic about England and the English that we must perhaps make some allowance for his predilections in estimating his panegyric of the Archbishop. It may be, however, quoted for what it is worth, especially as it was written to so high a personage as the Pope, Leo X., in addressing whom we may assume that he would measure his words. 'Whatever,' he writes, 'I have become, I owe to William Warham, Archbishop of Canterbury, Primate of all England, in no empty title. In addition to all his other titles and dignities, he has been the Mecænas of learning. Chiefly through him it has been wrought that an island long ago flourishing in men, in arms, and in wealth, now enjoys the blessings of admirable laws, religion, and morals, and of genius trained in every kind of literature, so that it may enter the lists on equal terms with any country.' Perhaps a calmer judge of the state of England in the early part of the sixteenth century will scarcely endorse Erasmus' favourable opinion of it; and even when he *can* agree with our grateful visitor, he will scarcely attribute so much of the improvement to the Archbishop of Canterbury.

For Warham was completely overshadowed by his more famous brother of York, who was also a powerful and munificent patron of the new learning. The notice of Cardinal Wolsey must, in our present connection, be limited to two points—his relation to

the new learning, and his relation to Church reform. On the first point there can be no doubt. Cardinal and Papal Legate though he was, he threw himself heartily into the schemes which tended eventually to destroy the Papal power in England. The splendid foundations which he projected and partially carried out at Oxford, and at his native Ipswich, were intended to be homes, not only of learning generally, but of 'the new learning' in the technical sense of the term. To him was due the foundation of a public professorship of Greek at Oxford, Bishop Foxe having two years before (1517) instituted a Greek lectureship at Corpus. Cardinal's College was to be essentially a College of the Renaissance, and the fact that it was founded on the ruins of S. Frideswide's Priory, which would, of course, have been a nursery of the old, and a sworn foe of the new, system, gives an additional significance to the intention. It was in 1524 that he procured from the Pope a Bull for the dissolution of the priory, and in 1525 that he received letters patent from the King for the erection of the college.

As to Wolsey's connection with the agitation for Church reform, it would seem at the first blush impossible that by far the most opulent and luxurious clergyman of that or any age, one who for many years had been amassing preferments, to the duties of which he could not possibly attend, should be seriously in earnest about a reform the primary object of which was to check the opulence, the luxury, the non-residence, and the neglect of duty, of the clergy; it is too much like the Gracchi complaining of sedition. At any rate, he could not be said to come into Court with clean hands. But, then, the same

remark will apply in a less degree to others about whose sincerity in the matter of reform there can be no question. Neither Colet, nor Grocyn, nor Linacre, was quite immaculate. As early as 1518 Wolsey procured authority from the Pope for a visitation of the monasteries with a view to their reform, and in 1519 still further power for the same purpose. So long as there was an Archbishop of Canterbury above him, he could not be *de jure* what he had long been *de facto*, the first Churchman and subject in England. It was in connection with the Reform movement that the Archbishop of York stepped over the head of the Archbishop of Canterbury. Warham, whose zeal for Church reform was unquestionably sincere, was a timid, diffident man, and he felt that the task was too great for him. It must be dealt with, not by the constitutional authority, but by a direct representative of the Head of Western Christendom. Hence he acquiesced in the appointment of a Legate *a latere*, knowing full well that that Legate could be none other than Wolsey, who would become, in virtue of the office, a greater man than himself. Wolsey soon showed that he meant his new power to be a reality; for when Warham summoned a synod of his clergy at Lambeth to deal thoroughly with the subject of Church reform, Wolsey wrote a haughty letter to him, reminding him that it belonged to the office of the Legate *a latere*, not to that of the Archbishop of Canterbury, to take the initiative in such a matter; and the meek Primate yielded, as usual, to the more powerful will of his Northern brother. There is no doubt that Wolsey did project measures of Church reform; nor were these measures entirely confined

to the reform of practical abuses. Cardinal and Legate though he was, Wolsey certainly at one time showed a leaning towards a doctrinal reformation. Otherwise he would scarcely have invited promising scholars from Cambridge who were almost exclusively attached to the reform party to come and act as teachers and lecturers at his magnificent new college at Oxford. The result was that a party was established at Oxford similar to that at Cambridge which held its meetings at the White Horse Inn, nicknamed 'Germany,' because its frequenters were imbued with the German notions of Martin Luther. 'Would God,' exclaimed Dr. London, the Warden of New College, in dismay, 'that my Lord his grace [Wolsey] had never motioned to call any Cambridge man to his most godly college! It were a gracious deed if they were tried and purged and restored unto their mother from whence they came if they be worthy to come thither again. We were clean without blot or suspicion till they came!' It is fair to add that, when Wolsey saw the result of what he had done, he drew back, and those students who were found in possession of Lutheran volumes were treated most cruelly; but the fact remains that he introduced them.[1] Richard Foxe, Bishop of Winchester, wrote to Wolsey in 1520, saying that his reform of the clergy was a day he desired to see, as Simeon desired to see the Messiah. This introduces to us the name of another famous man who must certainly be regarded as a patron of the movement we are considering.

Richard Foxe (1447 or 1448 to 1528), like most of the

[1] See J. B. Mullinger's 'University of Cambridge,' vol. i., ch. vi., pp. 601-608.

higher clergy of his day, was a statesman at least as much as a Churchman. Circumstances made him so. He was a trusted friend of King Henry VII., by whose side he had stood when the future King landed at Milford Haven, and for whose decisive victory on Bosworth Field he had been appointed one of the first to give public thanks. We need not trace out here Foxe's various ecclesiastical and political appointments and preferments,[1] but may pass on at once to his connection with the new learning and the Reform movement. In 1501 he was translated from the rich bishopric of Durham to the still richer see of Winchester, and in his new diocese 'he found the clergy, and especially the monks (which he did not at first expect), so depraved that, if there were a reform, it must be by a stronger arm and on a larger scale.' Hence his welcome of Wolsey's projects. But he meant by reform what Colet and More, not what Luther, meant by it. He evidently did not despair even about the monks, for he purposed establishing a house at Oxford for the reception of his own young monks of S. Swithun, Winchester, where they might complete their education. But when his brother of Exeter, Dr. Hugh Oldham, heard of his design, he exclaimed to him: 'What, my lord! shall we build houses and provide livelihoods for buzzing monks, whose end and fall we ourselves may live to see? No, no, it is more meet a great deal that we should have care to provide for the increase of learning, and for such as who by their

[1] For information on these points, and, indeed, on all points connected with Bishop Foxe, the reader may be referred to Dr. Fowler's admirable 'History of Corpus Christi College, Oxford,' published by the Oxford Historical Society (ch. i.).

learning shall do good in the Church and Commonwealth.' In consequence of this advice, Bishop Foxe changed his plans, and, instead of building a house for 'the religious,' founded Corpus Christi College, which was not only intended, like All Souls' and Merton, for the secular clergy, but was also the first college of the Renaissance at Oxford. Letters patent from Henry VIII. were issued for its foundation in 1516, and its first statutes were given by the founder in 1517. These statutes show markedly that Bishop Foxe intended to encourage the new learning. They provide for the institution of a public lecturer in Greek, who was to lecture to the whole University; and thus Corpus has the honour of being the first college which officially recognised the study of Greek at Oxford; the reader in theology was to follow in his interpretation of Holy Scripture the Greek and Latin Fathers rather than the scholastic commentators; and the Latin reader was to be careful 'to extirpate all barbarisms from our beehive,' Bishop Foxe, in the true spirit of the Renaissance, laying great stress on the cultivation of classical Latin. To ensure this being done, he imported from Italy the humanist, Ludovicus Vives, to be the first Latin reader, and he also chose for the first President of the college the pious John Claymond, a distinguished classical scholar. It may be added that Bishop Hugh Oldham, by whose advice the college was founded as it was, became one of its earliest benefactors.

Hitherto Oxford has come before us far more prominently than Cambridge; but henceforth for some years we shall have more to tell about Cambridge, which is chiefly indebted for being brought to the front to one man. This man was the excellent

John Fisher (? 1459 - 1535), who was educated at Michael House, Cambridge, elected a Fellow of the House in 1491, and its Master in 1497. In 1501 he became Vice-Chancellor of the University, and he seems to have devoted himself for many years to the work of raising Cambridge from the low estate into which it had fallen. The Renaissance gave him an admirable opportunity of so doing; for though the new learning had, as we have seen, established a home at Oxford, and its most distinguished representatives were found there, it also met with much ignorant and stupid opposition in that University. On the one side were those who encouraged the study of the classical literature of Greece, and that of the Greek Testament in the original, and also the interpretation of Holy Scripture according to grammatical rules and the sense of the early Fathers, not according to the scholastic method. On the other were the reactionists; and chief among these were the friars, who preached against the new learning in their homely way, and used the terms 'Greekling' and 'heretic' as synonymous. The connection between the study of Greek and heresy may be traced back to the old controversy between the Eastern and the Western Churches; the fact that the early Greek Fathers, whose writings were specially recommended by Erasmus and his friends, wrote long before that controversy arose was ignored—perhaps not known; for the opponents of the new learning were not the most learned men in the University. The junior members took the matter up, and absurdly adopting the names of old Trojan heroes, 'Priam,' 'Hector,' 'Paris,' and so forth, rabbled the adherents of the new study. Royal authority had to

be invoked, and, in the words of Erasmus, 'rabulis impositum est silentium';[1] but Oxford had seriously suffered in the ignoble fray. Amongst others, she lost Erasmus himself, who 'migrated' (if we may use, not quite accurately, a University term) to Cambridge, and held the Lady Margaret Professorship from 1511 to 1514, in which capacity he did more than any living man to discredit the 'old learning' and to commend 'the new.' Other quiet students, who only desired to pursue their favourite studies in their own way unmolested, began to prefer Cambridge to Oxford; and Fisher, above all men, helped to make it an acceptable home to them. He was the confessor and trusted friend of the pious Countess of Richmond and Derby, mother of King Henry VII., known *par excellence* as 'the Lady Margaret.' In 1503 she appointed him to fill her newly-founded professorship of divinity, which was intended to provide gratuitous instruction to the whole University, and in which Fisher would doubtless lecture to the satisfaction of the men of the new learning. She was also persuaded by him to found a preachership, in which the sermons were to be delivered in the vernacular for the benefit of the surrounding laity, and thus to encourage another object of the new movement, which was to diffuse light more extensively. In 1504 he obtained still greater influence in the University by being appointed its Chancellor, to which office he was elected annually for ten years. His appointment, through the influence of the King, to the bishopric of Rochester did not sever his connection with Cambridge. On the contrary, that connection was further cemented; for in 1505 he

[1] 'Opera,' iii. 408.

became President of Queens' College, and in the same year superintended the foundation of Christ's College by Lady Margaret. The story of the latter foundation is a curious instance of the signs of the times. Lady Margaret had herself taken monastic vows, and she purposed to devote the bulk of her property to the extension of the great monastery at Westminster; but Fisher represented to her that it would be more useful to devote it to educational purposes instead; hence arose Christ's College, which was followed by a still more important foundation, that owed its existence to the same benefactress, though it was not completed until after her death. This was S. John's College, founded in 1514 on the dissolution of an ancient hospital called the Brethren of St. John. This also became a seat of the new learning, and Fisher greatly contributed to make it so by founding there lectureships in Greek and Hebrew.[1] In fact, he showed himself in favour of the movement in every way; he adopted the new method of Bible criticism, he actually endeavoured to learn Greek himself when he was quite an old man, he invited Erasmus to Cambridge and procured his appointment to the Lady Margaret professorship of divinity, and he expressed his appreciation of the great scholar's labours on the New Testament in the most enthusiastic terms. Fisher's labours were seconded by those of Richard Croke, of

[1] It is no wonder that Mr. J. B. Mullinger, himself a distinguished member of S. John's College, should have made Fisher his hero *par excellence;* but enthusiastically as he writes of this great and good man, he does not rate him more highly than Fisher thoroughly deserved to be rated. See 'University of Cambridge,' vol. i., pp. 440 444, 628, 629, and *passim.*

King's College, who was a Greek Reader, and others. But there were never at Cambridge any number of men who took so leading and so effective a part in the Renaissance, as distinguished from the Reformation movement, as the little group of Oxonians mentioned above. Erasmus found none, except Fisher, at Cambridge at all equal to them. The work was afterwards taken up by Smith, Cheke, and Roger Ascham.

Henry VIII. himself must also be regarded as a patron of the new learning;[1] he encouraged the projects of Wolsey and others to introduce it into the educational curriculum; and there is a story that when Sir Thomas More was with the King at Abingdon in 1518, an old-fashioned clergyman preached at Court against the study of Greek and the new method of interpreting Holy Scripture. Sir Thomas afterwards confuted him in Henry's presence, to the great delight of that monarch. Sir Thomas More took the opportunity of calling the King's attention to the opposition at Oxford against the teaching of Greek, and obtained the royal sanction to send a letter to the tutors of that University, enjoining them to recognise the extension of education beyond the mediæval limits. When the men of the new learning took, as a rule, the King's side in the matter of the divorce, it is needless to say that his favourable inclination towards them was not weakened. It is a singular instance of the difference between Henry in his earlier and Henry in his later years, that, when the war-fever was upon him, he not

[1] Mr. Hutton says that 'Henry VIII. was at his accession as prominent a figure in England's Renaissance as he afterwards became in her Reformation' ('Sir T. More,' p. 41).

only did not resent the brave preaching of Dean Colet against war, but at an interview with this great luminary of the Renaissance said aloud: 'Let everyone have his doctor; this is the doctor for me.'[1]

It may be thought that too much stress has been laid upon this movement which preceded the Reformation, especially as none of those who survived really identified themselves with the latter movement. But the shape which the Church of England ultimately took was modelled on the Renaissance rather than on the Reformation proper. The Laudian movement was to a great extent a return from the ideas of the sixteenth to those of the fifteenth century. And, again, the Renaissance did more than anything else to deal the death-blow to mediævalism; and the extinction of mediævalism was one of the chief causes of the abolition of the jurisdiction of Rome in England. No doubt the men who were most prominent in the Renaissance were not at all the kind of men to bring about a root-and-branch reform. Neither their principles nor their temperament inclined them to any such task. They had really no particular quarrel with the old system of the mediæval Church, but merely with its abuses. And if they had a quarrel, it certainly required rougher weapons than theirs to fight the battle. The delicate banter of More and Erasmus, and the refined scholarship of Grocyn and Linacre, were not the sort of instruments by which a system could be upset; but, indirectly, the Renaissance was, in the way mentioned above, a preparatory measure for the Reformation, all the more effective because there were other causes at work.

[1] Milman's 'Annals of S. Paul's Cathedral,' ch. vi., p. 123.

The monks and friars had been the mainstay of the Papal influence in the English Church, and *their* decay meant the decay of that influence. And it was just at the time when her most powerful supporters were being more and more discredited that Rome drew tighter and tighter the cord with which she bound England, till it was ready of itself to snap. Englishmen had to acquiesce, because they could not help themselves, in the purely novel and anomalous arrangement by which archbishops, and even bishops, were made cardinals and legates *a latere;* but they never liked it; they saw clearly enough that such doings were utterly subversive of the first principles of a National Church. Neither did they like the audacious violations of those patriotic Statutes of Provisors and Præmunire, which, though re-enacted with fresh stringency over and over again, had, by the persistent efforts of Rome, become practically a dead letter. There were many other encroachments against which they chafed, and so they were quite ready to welcome the first chance that offered for throwing off the intolerable yoke.[1] The pity of it is that that chance came through the arbitrariness of a licentious tyrant, and in connection with the odious and disreputable business of his divorce. This, which was purely an accident of it, cast a slur upon that Reformation, of which it was, at most, the proximate occasion, not in any sense the cause. But we are now passing from the Renaissance to the Reformation period, which must form the subject of a separate chapter.

[1] In the quaint language of Professor J. J. Blunt: 'If the fire did at last run over the country with wonderful rapidity, it was because the trees were all dry' ('Sketch of the Reformation in England,' ch. i., p. 1).

CHAPTER XII.

THE TUDOR PERIOD.

The Church in the Reign of Henry VIII. (1509-1547).

Combination of advantages enjoyed by Henry VIII. at his accession — His book against Luther — Misgivings about validity of his marriage — Anne Boleyn — 'The King's matter' discreditable to almost all concerned — The Reformation Parliament—Fall of Wolsey—Church reform discussed both in Parliament and Convocation—Majority of spiritualty against the divorce—Thomas Cranmer—Universities of Europe consulted — Cranmer supersedes Gardiner in King's confidence—Thomas Cromwell chief instigator of what next happened—The royal supremacy—'Supreme Head'—Accepted by clergy with a saving clause—Protest of Tunstall—'Supplication of the Commons against the Ordinaries'—Resistance of clergy—First 'Submission of the Clergy'—Abolition of payment of annates and tenths to Pope—'Restraint of Appeals'—Cranmer Archbishop of Canterbury—Henry's appeal to a general council—Second Act of Restraint of Appeals—Act concerning Peter's Pence and dispensations — Final Submission of Clergy—Act of Succession—Execution of Fisher and More—Suppression of Friars Observant—Cromwell's visitation of monasteries as Vicar-General—'The Black Book'—Dissolution of smaller monasteries—Rising in Lincolnshire—Pilgrimage of Grace in Yorkshire—Dissolution of larger monasteries—Latimer's sermon against Church abuses—English will not break off from Catholic Church—English translations of the Bible—The 'Ten Articles'—'Institution of a Christian Man,' or 'Bishops' Book'—The 'Law of the Six Articles'—'Erudition of a Christian Man,' or 'King's Book'—Primers—Henry's relations to the National Church.

NOTHING impresses upon one more forcibly the continuity of the English Church than the extreme

difficulty of fixing even approximately the date of the English Reformation. 1529 is the date generally given for its commencement; and there is, perhaps, more reason for fixing that year than any other, for in the autumn of 1529 the Reformation Parliament commenced its sittings, and during the seven eventful years of its existence (1529-1536) most of the changes which formed the turning-points of the English Church were either completed or commenced. But if the Church had stopped where it was in 1536, or if it had begun to move only in 1529, history would have to be re-written. The doings of the Parliament of 1529 would be quite unintelligible unless we took into account what had occurred during the twenty years preceding; and if we commence with 1509, we must still carefully bear in mind the various movements which have been recorded in the last chapter, for in one sense they were not only preparations for, but actually parts of, the Reformation movement; and at the other end, in the year 1536, the Church had advanced but a very little way indeed in the direction of 'Reformation,' as the expression is generally understood. It has been thought best therefore on the whole, seeing that this is a sketch of the *National* Church, to commence this new era with the accession of that national ruler under whom the new state of things commenced.

In 1509 a young King ascended the throne who possessed such a combination of advantages, partly personal, partly accidental, and partly the result of circumstances, as has never fallen to the lot of any English monarch before or since. His lamentable degeneracy in later years really seems to be in part

owing to the fact that he was a spoilt child of fortune in his earlier. Heir of the Lancastrian line through his father, and of the Yorkist through his mother, Henry VIII. succeeded, not only to the claims, but to the wealth of both; add to this the hoards which his penurious father had amassed, and it will be readily seen that he was wealthy beyond any monarch that had gone before him. And he was accountable to no one for his expenditure. He might have been quite independent of Lords and Commons, even if they had been as powerful a body as they were a century before. But the Wars of the Roses had swept away most of the baronial families which had been effectual checks to the undue influence of the Crown, and their successors were for the most part new creations, and therefore naturally subservient to the power which had raised them.[1]

[1] See Brewer's 'Life of Henry VIII.,' vol. i., pp. 69, 70. See also 'England in the Fifteenth Century,' by W. Denton, who puts in a most happy way the position of the Tudors (and his remark applies more closely to Henry VIII. at his succession than to any other of that remarkable family), and contrasts it with that of their unfortunate successors, the Stuarts, thus: 'The House of Tudor, in the person of Henry VII., gave to England a dynasty of dictators rather than a line of constitutional sovereigns; and the Tudor sovereigns must be estimated by the standard of the old dictatorship of Rome, not by that of a modern and constitutional authority. They were dictators, and well on the whole they did their work. . . . The Stuarts failed to comprehend the exceptional position of the Tudors, and tried to do the same, when the Tudors themselves had made the continuation of a dictatorship unnecessary and impossible' (pp. 124-126). To the same effect Bishop Stubbs ('Lectures on Mediæval and Modern History,' lecture xv., p. 337) describes Henry VII. as 'the founder of the Tudor dictatorship which steered England through the age of the Reformation.'

Henry, again, had all those personal advantages which in a simple state of society are attributed to the ideal king, and which, even in a more advanced state of civilization, are not without their weight. Tall, stalwart, and manly, he looked the king all over; and, as he had not yet become coarse and gross through self-indulgence, he was fair and beautiful as an angel. He was exceptionally well skilled in those athletic exercises which Englishmen have always valued at their full, and more than their full, worth; and his abilities and attainments were so much above the average that long before he had reached the prime of life he could contend on equal terms with the ablest and most learned writers of the day.[1] He had a frank and jovial manner which contrasted as advantageously with the closeness and reserve of his father as his splendid physique did with the bowed and emaciated frame which made Henry VII. an old man before his time. He was married to a Princess of one of the noblest and proudest families in Europe, who looked up to him as her paladin—her god. Partly by good fortune, partly by that aptitude to recognise genius which was inherited by his daughter Elizabeth, he had the services of an all-powerful Minister, the last and greatest of the great ecclesiastical statesmen who raised England from a third or fourth-rate Power to the very highest level in the scale of nations. It scarcely comes within the province of a *Church*

[1] More writes to Erasmus in the early part of Henry's reign, when he had become connected with the Court: 'Such is the virtue and learning of the King, and his daily increasing progress in both, that the more I see him increase in these kingly ornaments, the less troublesome the courtier's life becomes to me.'

history to dwell upon the extraordinary career of Thomas Wolsey, for, Cardinal, Archbishop, and Papal Legate though he became, it was not in distinctly Church affairs that he achieved his greatness. But as a foreign Minister and a financier he was without a rival;[1] his unparalleled success in these capacities affected the Church indirectly, but vitally, and the credit of Wolsey's administration fell largely upon Henry. As was observed in the sketch of Edward III.,[2] military glory has always had a disproportionate value in the eyes of Englishmen, and though the glory won in the small campaigns in France and Scotland in the early days of Henry VIII. fell far short of that won in the days of Edward, still, it was greater than any that had been achieved since the time of Henry V., and it gave promise of greater glory yet to be won; the conquerors at Flodden Field might hope to rival the achievements of Agincourt or Creçy. Add to all this a resolute will which evidently underlay the *bonhomie*, the lavishness, and the carelessness of the young King, and we can well understand how true is the remark of his most impartial biographer, that 'had Henry lived in a more poetic age he might by a very slight effort of the imagination have stood for the hero of an epic poem.'[3]

What is more to the present purpose, Henry

[1] The only other man who can be at all credited with the successful management of affairs in the early years of Henry VIII. was also an ecclesiastic, Ruthal, Bishop of Durham; and his part is wittily described in the words of the Venetian Ambassador, Giustinian: 'He sang treble to the Cardinal's bass.' See Brewer's 'Life of Henry VIII.,' vol. i., p. 57.

[2] See *supra*, p. 261. [3] Brewer's 'Life of Henry VIII.,' i. 4.

might have stood for the hero of a successful revolt against the domination of Rome under which his countrymen had long chafed. But he seemed the last man in the world to head such a movement. He was so ardent a champion of the Roman claims that he felt impelled to enter into the list of royal authors, and published in 1521 a work advocating those claims[1] against the attacks of Martin Luther, in recognition of which he received from the Pope the honourable title of 'Defender of the Faith,' a title still borne by our sovereigns. We need not stay to inquire how far the book was actually the work of Henry, or how far he was helped in its composition by Sir Thomas More,[2] or by Richard Pace, or by Bishop Fisher, his esteem for all of whom is another instance of the instinctive appreciation of genius which belonged to the Tudors. It at any rate expressed Henry's sentiments, and he was quite competent to write it. It was, indeed, part of an attempt to stamp out the rising Lutheranism in England. It appeared just after Luther's treatises had been publicly burnt at Paul's Cross and at both the Universities, just after Wolsey had issued his mandate to all the bishops in England, 'to take order that any books, written or printed, of Martin Luther's errors and heresies should be brought in to the Bishop of each respective diocese, and that every such Bishop receiving such books

[1] 'Assertio Septem Sacramentorum, contra Martinum Hæresiarchon.'

[2] Mr. Hutton thinks that the aid of More and Pace 'at most extended to the composition and the correction of the Latin style' (p. 196), and quotes in support of this view More's statement that he was only 'a sorter out and placer of the principal matters therein contained.'

and writings should send them up to him,' and just before the great and good Bishop Fisher published his 'Assertionis Lutheranæ Confutatio' (1523).

In his attitude towards Lutheranism as a system of faith Henry never varied. But in the interval between 1521 and 1529 a question had arisen which changed the whole face of affairs as regards Rome. There had always been some little misgiving about the validity of Henry's marriage with his brother's widow, though it had been set at rest for the time by the Papal dispensation. But circumstances had arisen to revive the misgiving even before the appearance of Anne Boleyn upon the scene. Henry had naturally been anxious to have a son and heir to his vast wealth and power, but none had been granted to him. The children whom Katharine had borne him had all died with the exception of one daughter, and this was regarded by the superstitious as a token of the Divine displeasure against the unlawful marriage. Negotiations had been entered into with France, and also with Spain, respecting a marriage with that one daughter, but in both cases they had been broken off on the ground that her legitimacy was questionable. Before this, however, Anne Boleyn had captivated the susceptible King. He may have had conscientious scruples about his marriage; but if so, they would have come with a better grace if they had been expressed before he had become obviously wearied of Katharine, and before he had begun to pay the most marked attentions to her rival. He applied to the same power to free him from the chain, through the intervention of which it had first been riveted. Then follows the tedious and repulsive story of the

divorce, in which no one comes out well, except, perhaps, the much-injured Queen herself. Certainly not Rome, for by her prevarication and indecision she would have goaded to fury a far less impatient spirit than Henry's. Not the King, for, let the difficulties of the problem have been what they might, they should have been settled before he attached himself to another woman. Not Wolsey, for he tried to play a double game, and showed a timidity and hesitation strangely in contrast with the splendid boldness and successfulness of his foreign policy. Not Cranmer, who rose to a doubtful eminence in connection with this most unsavoury business. Not Gardiner, his rival, who persisted in advocating 'a middle course' where no middle course was possible. Not the Universities, either English or foreign; for it is only too evident that pressure was brought to bear upon them, and that their decisions were not bonâ-fide decisions, though an Oxford man may record with satisfaction that Oxford was the last to yield, and then only in consequence of manifest threats from the King. In fact, as Canon Dixon most truly remarks, 'the divorce either defiled the character or touched the safety of all who were concerned in it.' But odious as the subject is in its general aspect, and still more so in its details, it must be dwelt upon, because it is idle to deny that the divorce was the occasion, though not the cause, of the changes which took place very gradually in the National Church during the sixteenth century. The essential constitution, indeed, of the Church was never changed; it continued on the same lines on which it had been settled by Theodore of Tarsus, and by Lanfranc; but its circumstances, its policy,

and, above all, its relation to the centre of Western Christendom, went through a vast change, the commencement of which may be dated from November, 1529, when the Reformation Parliament, and the Convocation which assembled at the same time, commenced their sittings. Six years had elapsed since a Parliament had been summoned, so autocratic had the King become; and this new Parliament merely met to echo the royal sentiments. The term Reformation Parliament is misleading. The picture conveyed to the mind's eye by so imposing a title is that of a number of stern, resolute men, some patriots, some fanatics, met together to upset the old and to commence the new. But such a picture would convey a ludicrously false impression of the true facts of the case. A more melancholy exhibition of feebleness and subserviency than that made by the Reformation Parliament cannot be found in Parliamentary annals; but the nomenclature means much less than it would appear to mean to modern ears. It was the custom to designate popularly particular Parliaments by particular titles, more or less—generally less—appropriate. Thus, as we hear of the Mad Parliament, the Good Parliament, the Unlearned Parliament, and, in later days, of the Long Parliament and the Short (or Barebone's) Parliament, so was the Parliament of 1529-1536 the Reformation Parliament. When it met, 'the King's matter' (as the divorce was euphemistically called) had been dragging its slow length along for some three or four years. Nothing had been settled, but it had already ruined the greatest Minister that England had seen for many a long day. Wolsey had fallen, and shortly after his fall had died,

a broken-hearted man. The real cause of his disgrace was his conduct, half inclining to the King, half to the Pope, in the divorce business. But the plea under which his ungrateful master, whom he had raised to the highest pinnacle of power, had compassed his ruin was a most inconsistent one. Wolsey was charged under the Statute of Præmunire with having broken the law of the land in accepting the office of Legate *a latere*, though it was probably at Henry's own request that the Pope had appointed him; at any rate, Henry had acquiesced for years in its open and public exercise. Of course, the charge could be made good in point of law, but it was a mean and iniquitous thing to do so. However, it served its purpose; there was no instrument to show the royal license; the great Minister's services were no longer required; he was suspected of having encouraged the dilatoriness of Rome in 'the King's matter,' and so he fell a victim to the impatience of his master, who desired to be rid of one wife in order to marry another. But if Wolsey had broken the law in becoming a Legate *a latere*, so also had all the English clergy in accepting his authority as such; so, to complete the rather grim farce, the whole body of the clergy were charged in the King's name with having broken the law by obeying the Legate whom the King himself had caused to be set over them; and they received a general pardon on payment of an enormous fine which was voted in 1531 in the shape of a subsidy by the Convocations of both provinces.

The Reformation Parliament had been called chiefly for the purposes of ecclesiastical legislation, and it set itself at once to the work of reforming Church abuses. It was a work which was much

needed, but it was also a work which none were more anxious to carry out than the clergy themselves, if they had only been allowed to do so. The reform of the ecclesiastical courts generally, and especially the fees paid in them—the fees on the probates of wills and on mortuaries—were the matters which first engaged the Parliament's attention; but those were the very matters which both Warham and Wolsey, the archbishops respectively of Canterbury and York, had been desirous to reform. And, in fact, at the very time when the representatives of the laity were discussing such questions at Westminster, the representatives of the clergy were discussing the same at S. Paul's, and, indeed, striving to bring about far more sweeping and effectual reforms. The morals of their own body, the conduct of ordinations, the system of Church patronage, and especially the holding of benefices in plurality, the laws, or, rather, the enforcement of the laws, about simony, the scandal of appointing vicars at a stipend below starvation-point, the state of the monasteries, the laxity in dealing with heretics—these were the very important points that were being handled by the clergy in their own proper constitutional assembly.

But if the clergy were in favour of reform, how was it that the reform measures which were passed in the House of Commons were rejected by the House of Lords, where the spiritual element was comparatively much stronger than it is now, owing to the presence of abbots and priors as well as bishops? The answer to this question brings us back again to the old question of the divorce, with which Church reform was inextricably, though very illogically, mixed up. The

majority of the spiritual peers were against the divorce. Warham, the aged Archbishop of Canterbury; Tunstall, Bishop of Durham; Fisher, of Rochester; West, of Ely; Clark, of Bath and Wells, had all been advocates of the Queen at her first trial, though, oddly enough, two of the leading representatives of the old learning—Stokesley, Bishop of London, and Gardiner, of Winchester—were less hostile to the divorce, the latter, indeed, being one of its chief promoters. If Bills like the Pluralities Bill were rejected in the Lords chiefly through the influence of the spiritual peers, it was not because those peers were obstructionists, but because they saw the real drift of the Commons, which was to depress the clergy, who were the main strength of the anti-divorce party.

In fact, to understand the complicated state of affairs, we must read everything in the light of 'the King's business.' That business had now reached its second stage, when the opinions of the most learned men in all the chief Universities in Europe on the subject were collected. It is at this point that a new actor appears upon the scene, who was destined to play a conspicuous but very painful part all through the rest of the reign of Henry and that of his son. This was *Thomas Cranmer* (1489-1556), who leaped at a bound from comparative obscurity into the most prominent position in the realm after that of the King. The popular story is that in the summer of 1529 he was staying at the house of a Mr. Cressy at Waltham, when Edward Fox, the King's almoner, and Stephen Gardiner, the King's secretary, were present; and that it was there that he threw out his famous suggestion that learned canonists at

all the Universities in Europe were the proper persons to consult about 'the King's matter.'[1] Everybody was arguing as if the question was, whether the King could or could not obtain a release from the tie which bound him to the Queen. But *was* that the real question? Surely, if a marriage with a brother's widow was contrary to the law of God, and if Katharine's marriage with Henry's elder brother Arthur had been consummated, her later marriage with Henry had been no marriage, and no human power, not even a dispensation from the Pope, could make it one; it had been a nullity from the beginning—a marriage *de facto*, but not a marriage *de jure*. Strictly speaking, it was idle to talk of a divorce in that case, for no divorce was necessary or possible. What had to be done, then, was first to inquire into the law and facts of the case, and the proper persons to ascertain these were the learned men, the theo-

[1] It is true that the idea of consulting the Universities of Christendom did not originate with Cranmer. At least two years before (1527) Wolsey had recommended the King 'to ask counsel of men of ancient study and famous learning, both in the Divine and civil laws,' in consequence of which recommendation there was an assembly of bishops at Westminster, who advised Henry 'to take the opinions of all the Universities in Christendom'; but it seems to me impossible to reject, as some modern historians have done, the whole story of Cranmer's advice at Waltham, which comes to us in the first instance from Cranmer's own secretary, Ralph Morice, and has been accepted without any doubt or hesitation by subsequent writers for many generations, which, moreover, offers the only adequate explanation I have ever seen of Cranmer's sudden rise into prominence, and of his having been immediately required by the King to write a treatise on the subject. His idea was an ingenious one, and merited the compliment said to have been paid to him by the King—'that he had got the right sow by the ear.'

logians and the canonists, who were specially trained to investigate such questions at the great seats of learning. If they decided that the marriage was no marriage, the King need wait no longer for the decision of the Pope, for there really was nothing for the Pope to decide. Henry was still a bachelor, and could marry whom he chose, and still remain a faithful son of the Church. Cranmer's views were reported by Fox to the King, and they exactly fell in, not only with his wishes, but also with his logic, for he was quite shrewd enough to perceive the force of the reasoning. He desired Cranmer to write a treatise on the subject, and procured his introduction into the household of the Earl of Wiltshire, Anne Boleyn's father; took him at once into his confidence; raised him at the earliest opportunity, which soon occurred through the death of Archbishop Warham, to the highest ecclesiastical position in the realm (1533);[1] and committed to him his interests in the matrimonial question.

The two chief advisers of the King in the matter of the divorce, and, indeed, in most other matters, had been Stephen Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester, his secretary, and Edward Fox, Bishop of Hereford, his almoner. Considering his future history, it is strange indeed that Gardiner should have been one of the chief agents in that event which was certainly the occasion, though not the cause, of the break with Rome, and all the results that ensued from that break; strange also that so very able and prominent a leader, as Bishop Fox evidently was in this early stage of the Reformation movement, should now be so little known. Both Gardiner and Fox, how-

[1] But Cranmer was not enthroned until December 3, 1534.

ever, pass comparatively into the background when Cranmer and Cromwell come to the front.

For simultaneous with the rise of Cranmer was that of another man, who was prepared for far more drastic measures than the timid Archbishop ever contemplated. This was *Thomas Cromwell* (1485-1540), a lawyer, who had passed through many adventures, and who had been high in the service and confidence of Wolsey,[1] when the star of that Minister was in the ascendant. At the downfall of his patron, Cromwell did not fall with him, but soon found means of ingratiating himself with the King, who made him a Privy Councillor only a few weeks after Wolsey's death. Cranmer was a mere puppet in the hands of these two strong-willed men, but he was exceedingly useful to both by lending a sort of ecclesiastical sanction to their high-handed proceedings. It was Cromwell who advised Henry to cut the Gordian knot, call himself Supreme Head of the Church, and marry Anne Boleyn off-hand; it was Cromwell who originated and carried out the monstrous scheme of sweeping the monasteries off the face of the land, and enriching the King's coffers with their possessions.[2] Of course, such vast changes

[1] When Wolsey became Archbishop of York, he made Cromwell the collector of his revenues, and availed himself of his services for many important purposes; he was addressed by correspondents as 'councillor to my Lord Cardinal,' and Anne Boleyn wrote to him in 1529 as 'secretary of my lord' [Wolsey].

[2] Little attention did Cromwell pay to the wonderfully shrewd, as well as wholesome, advice of Sir T. More: 'Master Cromwell, you are now entered into the service of a most noble, wise, and liberal prince; if you will follow my poor advice, you shall in counsel-giving unto his grace ever tell him what he ought to do, but never tell him what he is able, so shall you show your-

could not be effected in a moment, and we must return to the proceedings of Parliament and Convocation, while the triumvirate—Henry, Cranmer and Cromwell—were gradually bringing about what was more like a revolution than a reformation.

Of the various Acts, involving important changes in the Church, passed during the seven years of the Reformation Parliament, the majority were in themselves most desirable, but almost every one of them was clogged with some condition or rider, which rendered it unjust and dangerous to the Church's true interests. To begin with those which directly related to the severance of the Church of England from the Roman obedience. The assertion of the royal supremacy was a measure framed on purely constitutional lines. The King had always been regarded by law as supreme head over all persons, whether ecclesiastical or civil, within his own dominions. Gardiner published in 1536 an oration, 'De Verâ Obedientia,' in which he contended, among other things, 'that kings, princes, and Christian magistrates are each entitled to supremacy in their respective churches'; and Bonner, of all men in the world, is generally supposed to have written a preface to it.[1] The *primacy* of Rome had always been recog-

---

self a true, faithful servant and a right worthy counsellor. For if the lion knew his own strength, hard were it for any man to rule him' (quoted from Roper by Huth, p. 229). Cromwell's whole policy could not be better described than by saying that it was the exact opposite of that recommended by More. He made it his one business to let the lion know his own strength, and to encourage and help him to use it.

[1] The three points which Gardiner maintained, and Bonner sanctioned, in this treatise were: (1) that human tradition ought

nised, but her *supremacy*—never. Hence, in none of the Reformation statutes will be found any mention of the abrogation of the Papal supremacy, for the simple reason that no such supremacy had ever been admitted.[1] But it was not now considered sufficient to own the King as supreme over all persons, ecclesiastical as well as civil. A new title must needs be invented for him, 'the Supreme Head of the Church'; and before pardon was granted to the clergy for having broken the law of Præmunire by accepting the legatine authority of Wolsey, they were required to accept this new title. For three sessions in 1531 the matter was debated in the Southern Convocation, and it was at last agreed to in these memorable words: 'We acknowledge his Majesty to be the singular protector, only and supreme lord, and, so far as the Law of Christ

to be regarded as inferior to Divine precept; (2) that the Roman Pontiff has no legitimate power or jurisdiction over other churches; (3) that kings, princes, and Christian magistrates are each entitled to supremacy in their respective churches, and are bound to make religion their first care. In the teeth of two such very high authorities as Canon Dixon and Dr. Maitland, I dare not go further than to say that Bonner is generally supposed to have written the preface; but I am bound to add that neither of these accomplished authors has convinced me that he did not. If Bonner did not, who did?

[1] 'The legislation of Henry VIII.'s reign against the Pope's pretensions to jurisdiction in this kingdom did but carry to their full consequences, under the circumstances of that time, principles admitted in Anglo-Saxon times, for which Norman and Plantagenet kings had contended, which had been embodied in the Acts of their councils and Parliaments, and in which the ecclesiastical authorities of the realm had either actively concurred or at least practically acquiesced.'—The Earl of Selborne, 'A Defence of the Church of England against Disestablishment,' ch. i., pp. 8, 9.

allows, Supreme Head of the English Church and clergy'; and this declaration was subscribed by both Houses, and then by the York synod. The saving clause, 'so far as the Law of Christ allows,' just saved the acknowledgment from being purely Erastian, especially when read in the light which the Becket controversy throws upon it; but we are not surprised to learn that the bishops of the Northern Province, led by the most famous of them, Tunstall, of Durham,[1] objected to the expression 'Supreme Head'; and we shall soon find that the Supreme Head meant his headship to be no mere empty title, but a very formidable reality.

The year 1532 began with a most aggressive measure, entitled the Supplication of the Commons against the Ordinaries. The Supplication consists of two parts: the first, petitioning that the clergy should be allowed to enact no canons or constitutions without the royal consent; the second, that the old Church abuses, which were again specified, should be remedied. The sting of the Supplication lay in the first part. So far were the clergy from objecting to the second part, that they were actually devising

[1] In the vacancy of the archbishopric of York, Tunstall presided over this Convocation. He has left on record a very proper protest against the clause about the Supreme Head, in which, while fully admitting that the King is supreme head over clergy and laity alike in temporal matters, he denies that it is so in spiritual, and declares that, unless the clause is more fully guarded from this interpretation, he must express his dissent from it, and he desires that his 'protestation may be entered upon the journal of the Convocation.' This protest drew forth a valuable letter from Henry, which expressly acknowledged that the supremacy did not imply *potestas ordinis*, but only *potestas jurisdictionis*. See Makower's 'Constitutional History of the Church of England,' ch. v., § 28, p. 255.

means in Convocation for remedying the abuses complained of, when they received the message that their powers were to be crippled. They were urging the ordinaries to do their duty, when they heard that those ordinaries were to be deprived of the power of doing it. The first part of the Supplication was in direct violation of the first clause of the Magna Charta, which stipulated that the Church of England should be free. It had enjoyed the privilege of making its own ecclesiastical laws without the consent of the King, and without the privity of any of the laity, from time immemorial, and the very King whose creation the Reformation Parliament was had admitted this; for, as Bishop Gardiner had the hardihood to remind him, Henry had taken that very position in his answer to Luther eleven years before. Eleven years, however, is a far cry; and to the Tudor mind a foreign master was a very different matter from a master at home.

But the clergy did not submit without a very considerable and continued resistance. On April 12, 1532, Archbishop Warham introduced the subject before the Southern Convocation assembled at Westminster. The Supplication complained that the ecclesiastical laws then in force contained many things injurious to the King's prerogative and burdensome to the subject, and affirmed that the clergy claimed to enact new canons by their own sole authority, without the consent of the Crown. In a brief sketch like the present it is impossible to do more than give the general result, which was what was technically termed the Submission of the Clergy; but this did not take place until two years had elapsed, during which much opposition had been

raised[1] and many modifications made. In one point, however, the Submission went further than the Supplication. The King required, not only that the clergy should put forth no Acts for the future without the royal consent, but that the measure should affect what had already been put forth in the past; and it was at length agreed on the last day of the session of 1534 that the clergy were neither to execute any old canon or constitution nor to enact new ones without the assent and license of the King; that Convocations were only to be assembled by the authority of the King's writ; and that all the constitutions which had been put forth were to be examined, revised, and approved by a commission of thirty-two—sixteen to be chosen from the temporalty, and sixteen from the clergy, but all to be nominated by the King himself.[2]

In the interval, however, between the first Supplication of the Commons and the final Submission of the Clergy, which was its result, many important events occurred. In 1532 the benefit of clergy

[1] For a full account of the details of the opposition in Convocation, see Joyce's 'England's Sacred Synods,' ch. x., pp. 340-347.

[2] The Submission of the Clergy ran in these words: 'We do offer and promise, *in verbo sacerdotii*, here unto your Highness, submitting ourselves most humbly to the same, that we will never from henceforth enact, put in force, promulge, or execute, any new canon, or constitution provincial, or any new ordinance provincial, or synodal, in our Convocation or synod, in time coming (which Convocation is, always hath been, and must be, assembled only by your Highness's commandment or writ), unless your Highness, by your royal assent, shall license us to assemble our Convocation, and to make, promulge, and execute such constitutions and ordinances as shall be made in the same, and thereto give your royal assent and authority.'

was limited to those who had received at least sub-deacon's orders—a very desirable measure; for the Church was degraded by the impudent claim which many made to enjoy the benefit of clergy who had no right to consider themselves as belonging to the clerical order. In the same year an Act was passed for abolishing the payment of annates, or first-fruits of bishoprics and benefices, to the Pope. The clergy, so far from objecting to the Act, anticipated Parliament in petitioning for it in their Convocation of 1531, adding that, in case the Pope should persist in requiring such payments, the obedience of England should be withdrawn altogether from the see of Rome.[1] They might well desire to be rid of a burden which they ought never have been required to bear. Enough money went out of the country to enrich the coffers of Rome without this payment, which fell upon incumbents just at the time when they were least able to meet it; for the entering upon a benefice necessarily involves much additional expense. The annates, however, were not really abolished; they were simply transferred 'by one monstrous sweep'[2] to the Crown. The matter was not settled finally; it reappeared in a more aggravated form two years later.

The year 1533 was an eventful one. The miserable divorce case, having dragged through the mud almost everybody who had been connected with it, was now ended by the simple process of Henry

[1] Thus, as Mr. J. H. Blunt truly observes, 'the declaration of independence on the part of the Church of England originated with the clergy in Convocation, and not with the King or the Parliament' ('The Reformation of the Church of England,' ch. v., p. 255).

[2] Dixon, i. 139.

marrying—not before time—Anne Boleyn. This step was fraught with momentous consequences to the Church, not so much by the open defiance which the King of England thereby gave to the Pope, as by leading directly to the first Act which was a decisive blow aimed at the Roman jurisdiction. It was known that Queen Katharine would appeal, as a matter of course, from the judgment of the English courts to Rome, and therefore she was anticipated by the famous Act entitled the Restraint of Appeals, in the preamble of which it is asserted that 'the body politic called the spiritualty, now usually called the English Church, always hath been reported, and also found of that sort that both for knowledge, integrity, and sufficiency of number, it hath been always thought, and is also at this hour sufficient and meet of itself, without the intermeddling of any exterior person or persons, to declare and determine all such doubts, and to administer all such offices as to their rooms spiritual doth appertain.' Instead of appeals to Rome, the appeals were to be from the Archdeacon's court to that of the Bishop, from the Bishop's court to that of the Archbishop of the province, which was to be final. But later a further appeal was allowed to the King in Chancery (25 Hen. VIII., c. xix.).

It was in connection with the divorce that Cranmer was this year made Archbishop of Canterbury, the more obvious claims of Gardiner, Stokesley, Tunstall and others being passed over. His difficulties began from the first moment of his appointment; for, as the formal separation of England from Rome had not yet taken place, he had to swear the customary oath of obedience to the Apostolic See, though he knew

full well that he neither could nor would be obedient to it. He took the oath under protest, and, of course, at once broke it. His first work as Archbishop was to attend to 'the King's business,' which had raised him to his unenviable eminence. He submitted to the Convocation of his province the opinions of the foreign Universities, affirming the unlawfulness of Henry's marriage with Katharine; and after some warm debates, which were prolonged through several sessions, it was at last carried in both Houses that the marriage was unlawful. The Northern Convocation followed suit. Cranmer, in obedience to the King's mandate, set up his court at Dunstable, and summoned the unhappy Queen, who was living at Ampthill, to attend. On May 23 he pronounced the formal sentence of divorce, and on June 1 he crowned the new Queen. But the general body of the clergy did not take the same view as their representatives in Convocation, and the poor Archbishop had another very disagreeable office to perform. Sermons against the divorce were freely preached, and Cranmer had to forbid preaching in his own diocese, and to enjoin all the suffragans in his province to do the same.

Then followed a curious episode, which, if it were seriously intended, shows that the King still desired to keep within the due limits of Church law. He appealed against the Pope to a general council, and commanded the appeal to be set up on all church doors. This was a step of which all good Churchmen could approve in theory, for all agreed that the sentence of a general council would override that of the Pope, and also that it was the right of princes to call such a council; whether it was practicable or not

is another question. However, there was no harm done by making such an appeal; so the attestation was signed, not only by the 'Henricians,' but by such prelates as Fisher, West, and Clark. In his appeal the King protested that 'he meant to say or do nothing against the Holy Catholic Church and the authority of the Apostolic See which was inconsistent with his duty as a good Catholic Prince.' But it rather makes us doubt the sincerity of the protest when we find that he was at the same time meditating a league with the Lutherans, who were certainly not very submissve to 'the authority of the Apostolic See.' To complete the farce, the Archbishop of Paris, Monsignor Bellay, was employed to persuade the King to withdraw his appeal to a general council, and to submit his cause to the Roman Consistory; in which case it was hinted that the Pope would abandon the cause of Katharine and support that of Henry—always supposing that the King would be duly submissive to him. But the desertion of Katharine, however much it might please Henry, would be resented by her relative, the Emperor; and the upshot was that the imperial party in the Roman Curia prevailed, and only three out of twenty-two of the assembled cardinals voted for Henry. This, however, was not the cause of the separation of England from Rome; for that separation was already made by England herself before the news of the sentence could have reached her shores. This brings us to the events of 1534.

It was in this year that those laws were framed which finally severed England from Rome. First came a second Act for the Abolition of Annates, stricter than that of 1532, and requiring that the

election of bishops should be confined entirely within the kingdom. Then followed an Act concerning Peter's Pence and dispensations, which practically relieved English subjects from all dependence on the see of Rome; then the Acts already referred to, the Submission of the Clergy and the Restraint of Appeals, which completed the severance of the tie between England and the Apostolic See. Both Convocations—Canterbury on March 31, York on May 5—declared that 'the Bishop of Rome hath no greater jurisdiction conferred upon him by God in Holy Scripture in this kingdom of England than any other foreign Bishop,' a declaration which was signed, not only by the secular, but also by the regular clergy. There was also another Act of Parliament which was fraught with momentous consequences. It was natural enough that the divorce of Katharine and the exaltation of Anne in her place should be followed by an Act settling the succession upon the heirs of the latter. After the passing of this Act a commission was formed, consisting of the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Lord Chancellor, and the Duke of Norfolk, who sat at Lambeth to administer the oath of succession. This oath contained a preamble which no conscientious person who still had any lingering attachment to Rome (and there were many such) could possibly accept. Its first effect was to bring about the ruin of two of the noblest men of the day, Bishop Fisher and Sir Thomas More. There was no disposition to deal mercifully with either of them. Bishop Fisher had been implicated in the extraordinary delusion about Elizabeth Barton, the Holy Maid of Kent, whose latest visions threatened

disaster to the King, and he had lately been attainted and fined £300. Sir Thomas More had withdrawn from public life, having shown plainly enough his disapproval of the changes that were going on. Both were ready to swear to the succession, but they could not take the oath with its preamble as it stood. Cranmer interceded for them with the King, begging him to be content with this modified submission;[1] but the King 'in no wise so willed it,' and Fisher and More suffered, if not martyrdom, at any rate death for conscience' sake, in 1535.

The oath and its preamble also touched the monasteries, which had always been more closely connected with Rome than any other part of the English Church. It had already been provided that neither the Archbishop of Canterbury nor any other person was 'to visit or vex' any of the exempt monasteries. They were to be left to the mercy of the King, or such persons as the King might appoint under the Great Seal. The net was evidently enclosing within its meshes these doomed institutions. The friars, as being the most immediately connected with Rome, were the first orders that were attacked. The Friars Observant (that is, those who observed most strictly

[1] *I.e.*, that they might be sworn to the Act alone without the preamble. Cranmer also used a very characteristic argument with More, who, with his usual kindliness, asserted constantly that, though he could not take the oath himself, he did not condemn those who took it. 'If,' argued the Archbishop, 'he did not condemn those who took the oath, then he was evidently not certain whether it was wrong to take it; but he *was* certain about his duty to the King; *argal*, he might with a clear conscience take the oath, for he would be performing a certain duty, and only neglecting an *un*certain one.' See Hutton's 'More,' p. 243.

the rule of S. Francis) were particularly obnoxious, because they had been implicated in the affair of the Holy Maid of Kent. The oath of succession therefore, with its preamble, was tendered to them and refused. 'They had professed,' they said, 'S. Francis' religion, and in the observance thereof they would live and die.' Their whole order was at once suppressed, two years before any of the other orders were touched.

Henry, as Supreme Head on earth of the Church, had now made Thomas Cromwell his Vicar-General,[1] who in this capacity commenced a visitation of the monasteries, either in person or by his subordinates. The oath of succession did not prove to be so effectual a weapon as was expected. With the exception of the Friars Observant, the Brigittites (who only possessed one house, that of Sion at Brentford), and the London Carthusians, none of the orders refused to take it; every Abbot in England subscribed both to the Act of Supreme Head and also to that of the Succession. It was necessary, therefore, to find some other pretext for the proposed dissolution. The task of dissolving the monasteries was a tremendous one, for the regular outnumbered the secular clergy in the proportion of ten to one, and they were largely represented both in Parliament and in Convocation. But the monastic system had long been on the wane, and the principle of their dissolution was introduced, not by Crom-

[1] In the preamble of his commission to hold 'a general visitation of churches, monasteries, and clergy,' Cromwell is described as 'the King's vicegerent in all causes ecclesiastical, supreme over bishops and archbishops, commissioned thoroughly to reform the Church from abuses which its appointed rulers had scandalously allowed to grow.'

well, but by Cromwell's master, Cardinal Wolsey. 'Wolsey's Bull,' writes Bishop Creighton, 'for the wholesale dissolution of small monasteries was the beginning of a process which did not cease till all were swept away.'[1] There was, however, this vast difference between Wolsey's and Cromwell's work —Wolsey suppressed monasteries only to convert them into colleges and bishoprics; Cromwell, to supply the wants of a greedy and now needy King and his rapacious courtiers. When Cromwell's visitation began, a large proportion of the monasteries anticipated their inevitable fate; out of twelve hundred religious houses, nearly half dissolved themselves without waiting for suppression. The general visitation commenced in October, 1535. It is impossible to regard the reports sent in as trustworthy; for, in the first place, the visitors held a brief against the defendants; they came prepared to hear all the evil they could, and not to sift the stories told them too narrowly. When the matter was discussed at the Council Board, previous to the appointment of a visitation, ominous hints were dropped which would be enough to intimate to the visitors what line they were expected to take. 'The Government must have people to work and fight as well as to preach and pray for it,' otherwise 'our generals and captains should be made bishops and deans, and our men-of-war and forts be turned into chapels and religious houses'; 'those who visit should be authorized to discharge those religious who find their vows too much for them; to open the cloister, to suit their tempers better, and give them the freedom of the world'; and, still more significantly, 'it

[1] 'Thomas Wolsey,' p. 142.

might be desirable to proportion the fortunes of the spiritualty and temporalty, and bring the kingdom to an evener balance.'[1] Decidedly the visitors had their cue given them. Again, in the unsettled state in which the monasteries then were, discipline was sure to be relaxed, and their present condition could not be regarded as a fair specimen of their normal state; and, finally, in such institutions there would always be some inmates who had entered against their will, or before they knew their own minds, and such persons would be only too ready to make the worst of the abuses that existed, in the hope of effecting an escape from their prison-house. At the same time, it is not denied that there *were* real abuses which cried for redress, and under any circumstances the system was doomed, and would probably have collapsed even if there had been no Henry and no Cromwell.

After a declaration made by the King to Parliament of the reports of the visitors in a document appropriately called 'The Black Book,' a Bill was introduced in 1536 for suppressing the smaller monasteries—that is, all those whose income did not exceed £200. Whether these smaller houses were really more corrupt than the larger, or whether they were attacked first because they were weaker, not only from their size, but also because the larger were represented by the abbots and priors in the House of Lords, need not here be discussed. The Bill was passed, the abbots themselves offering no opposition to it; the smaller houses were all dissolved, and three years later the larger shared the same fate.

[1] See Joyce's 'England's Sacred Synods,' ch. xi., p. 435.

But this later and greater work was not effected until two formidable risings in the North had afforded a pretext for it. The first took place in Lincolnshire, in the autumn of 1536, and arose from the visitation of a small Cistercian nunnery at Legbourne, a village three miles south-east of Louth, where the Lady Superior was so confident of the purity of her establishment that she herself actually invited the inspection of the visitors. The cause of the rising was not only the dissolution of religious houses, but a general disapproval of the King's counsellors, and a fear lest the plate, jewels, and ornaments of the parish churches should be confiscated, as the property of the religious houses was. Hence the Vicar of the neighbouring town of Louth, Thomas Kendal, became one of the ringleaders. The Bishop of the diocese (Dr. John Longland) had been very active in the interests of Cromwell, and this would, no doubt, tend to confirm the impression that an attack was intended upon the parish churches. The movement was headed by one who called himself 'Captain Cobbler.' Dr. Mackarel, Abbot of the important house of Præmonstratensian Canons at Barlings, about twenty miles off, joined the insurgents, and so did the clergy generally. The Chancellor of Lincoln was murdered at Horncastle, as the representative of the obnoxious Bishop, and the riot was assuming formidable proportions, when it collapsed as suddenly as it had arisen. Cobbler and the other leaders were surrendered by the different towns to which they had fled; the Vicar of Louth and the Abbot of Barlings were both hanged, and in reply to a petition of the rebels, the King uttered the memorable words, which

a Lincolnshire man finds it hard to forgive: 'Rude commons of a most brute and beastly shire,' etc.

The rising in Lincolnshire was immediately followed by a far more serious one in Yorkshire and other Northern counties. The grievances of the insurgents were precisely the same as those of the Lincolnshire men. Appeals were made in every parish, urging the inhabitants 'to appear in their best array on the day appointed for each.' Those who obeyed the summons and joined the movement took an oath 'to enter the Pilgrimage of Grace only for the love they bore unto Almighty God and His Faith, and to Holy Church, and to the preservation of the King's person and issue.' They seized the town of Pontefract, and the Archbishop of York himself (Lord Darcy) was either induced or compelled to take the oath. They numbered no less than 30,000 men, and marched on from Pontefract to Doncaster, bearing their banner of the Five Wounds of Christ, the Chalice and the Host, and having embroidered on their sleeves the badge 'In the Name of the Lord.' A conference was held, and the audacity of the rebels' demands shows how confident they were of success. They required 'the recognition of the legitimacy of the Princess Mary, the utter extirpation of the books of the heretics from Wyclif to Tyndale, and the restoration of the Supreme Headship of the Church to Rome.' They had the ecclesiastical authorities of the North on their side; for the Convocation of York met, and protested against almost everything that had been done since Cromwell came into power. In short, everything seemed to threaten a very formidable insurrection; but it was quelled, by craft rather than force. The

pilgrims were induced to lay down their arms by the promise of a free pardon, and of a Parliament to be held in some place appointed by the King within a year to consider their grievances. On these terms, headed by Aske, their leader, they laid aside their badges, declaring, 'We will bear no badge nor figure but the badge of our Sovereign Lord.'

The promises given were never fulfilled; but the fact of their having been given helped to confirm an impression which prevailed outside England, that the rebels had really carried their points. Both in France and at Rome it was expected that England would have to return to the Roman obedience. The King's own relative, Reginald Pole, who had just been made a Cardinal, was sent on a mission to rally the Powers which were still faithful to Rome, and with their help to bring back the erring island Church into the fold. It is needless to add that he soon found out his mistake. Aske and the rebel leaders, instead of dictating a policy to Henry, were hanged; and the only result of the Pilgrimage of Grace was that it afforded another pretext to Henry and Cromwell for laying violent hands on the larger monasteries. The task was easier, because the inmates of these monasteries were divided into factions among themselves, some being desirous to submit to, others to resist, the wishes of the King. There was no Act of Parliament ordaining the suppression of the large monasteries, as there had been for the smaller. They were simply invited to surrender to the commissioners; but when an Abbot refused the invitation he was summarily dealt with. Hugh Faringdon, Abbot of Reading, on his refusal, was convicted of treason in the Court of King's Bench, and hanged

at Reading; the same happened to the Abbot of Colchester, and to Richard Whiting, the last Abbot of Glastonbury, who were both executed near their own homes. It had been expressly admitted in the Act for the dissolution of the smaller monasteries that 'there were divers and great solemn monasteries of this realm, wherein (thanks be to God!) religion is right well kept and observed.' But this good character did not save them. One by one they all went; and then an Act was passed empowering the King to create new bishoprics out of the monastic revenues. Six of the old abbeys were erected into bishops' sees, viz.: Oxford, Peterborough, Chester, Gloucester, Bristol, and Westminster; fifteen chapters attached to collegiate churches, several hospitals, a few grammar schools, and two magnificent colleges (Trinity, Cambridge, and Christ Church, Oxford) owe their foundation to the same source. But by far the greater part of the money went to the enrichment of the King and his courtiers. In the case of the smaller monasteries, the astute Cromwell had advised that the King should sell the property to the gentry on easy terms, and thus enlist them on his side. The same policy was pursued with regard to the greater. As Mr. Mullinger expresses it, 'The most influential of the nobility and gentry were bribed into acquiescence by the promise or the actual bestowal of the richest abbey lands, while the scholar and the Churchman were induced to keep silence by the hope of seeing new and splendid homes of learning endowed from the monastic spoils'[1] —a hope which was only very partially fulfilled.

The hopes of the Roman party in England were

[1] Mullinger's 'University of Cambridge,' vol. ii., ch. i, p. 20.

raised for a moment by the ruin of the hapless Queen Anne, who had always been regarded as a patroness of the Reformation; but it was soon seen that the catastrophe would make no difference in the state of religious affairs. A significant token of this was given in the appointment of the famous Hugh Latimer, Bishop of Worcester, to preach the Latin sermon at the opening of Convocation in June, 1536. Latimer, who was almost as much in the confidence of the King as even Cranmer or Cromwell, delivered, *more suo*, a rousing appeal to his brother members of Convocation to reform Church abuses, which was rather a cruel mockery, seeing that they had just had the power of reforming those abuses taken away from them by the preacher's own patron, and that at the very time when they were seriously settling themselves to the work of reform.

Hitherto our attention has been turned chiefly to practical, not to speculative matters; but the 'Defender of the Faith' had naturally much to say about doctrine as well as discipline. His general principle was to adhere closely to the faith of the Catholic Church, while discarding the jurisdiction of Rome, and on the whole he was fairly consistent in the application of this principle. It was horribly cruel, but it was not inconsistent, to put to death on the one side men like More, Fisher, and Houghton (the Prior of the London Carthusians) for favouring the *jurisdiction* of Rome—for that, and not the denial of the royal supremacy, was the real cause of their deaths—and on the other side men like John Frith for denying the *faith* of Rome. It seemed to those who could not make the distinction like the freak of a mad tyrant; but there was method in his

madness. Henry was not an ignoramus; his faults were not faults of the head, but of the heart, or, rather, of a pampered, wilful nature spoilt by too much flattery and too much power. There is a passage in the 'Reply' of Starkey to Pole's 'Defence of Church Unity'[1] which so clearly describes the situation that it is worth quoting: 'Herein lies the sum of your book: because we are slipped from the obedience of Rome, you judge us to be separate from the Unity of the Church, and to be no members of the Catholic body. Weigh this cause yet a little, Master Pole, and despise not the consent of your country and of all the learned men therein with too much arrogancy. Though we be slipt from the obedience of Rome, denying any superiority to be due thereto from the law of God, yet we be not slipt a *fide Romanâ nec a Petri cathedrâ*. We observe and keep the same faith which from the beginning hath

[1] 'De ecclesiasticæ unitatis Defensione Libri Quatuor, ad Henricum Octavum, Britanniæ Regem.' The publication of this work adds one more to the many discreditable incidents connected with the divorce. Whatever Henry VIII. may have been to others, he had been a most kind friend and benefactor to Reginald Pole. Pole, of course, stood near the throne; experience showed that some who had had less claims had made use of those claims successfully to found a pretence to the succession. It was therefore highly important, from a political point of view, to know what Pole really thought about the divorce question, with a view to the succession. After a vast amount of prevaricating and shuffling, in which it is difficult to grasp what he meant, he at last, when he felt himself strong enough, with the powerful aid of the Emperor, to do so, turned upon his friend and benefactor, and abused Henry in this treatise in the most unmeasured terms as a tyrant, a very fiend incarnate. He threw himself unreservedly on the Roman side, and repeated all the stock arguments against the royal supremacy.

been taught at Rome;' and then he shows most conclusively that 'the ancient writers, Cyprian, Jerome, and all antiquity, were against the Papal supremacy.'

Now, let us remember that this was written before the Council of Trent had stereotyped the later dogmas of the Roman Church, and that it represents the ideal, not the actual, position of the English Church. And then let us apply it to one crucial point, the reading of the Scriptures in the vernacular. Mediæval Rome had forbidden this, but from the beginning it was not so. The English Church might fairly claim that she was 'keeping the same faith which from the beginning was taught at Rome,' when she ordered an English as well as a Latin Bible to be provided in every church. Neither was it inconsistent with this order that she had set her face steadily against the translation of Tyndale, and forbidden its admission as it came piece by piece into England. For, in the first place, each volume as it came brought with it, not only the text of the English version, but also a preface and notes, full of invectives against the English hierarchy; and, in the second place, it was one thing to admit a duly authorized translation, quite another to admit any version which a private individual might put forth, though, as a matter of fact, Tyndale was better qualified than he was once supposed to be.[1] In short, the

[1] Modern scholarship has by no means endorsed the mean opinion which was once held about Tyndale's version. It has remained for the present Bishop of Durham (Dr. Westcott) to vindicate the claims of Tyndale unanswerably. He has shown in his 'History of the Bible' that 'by far the greater part of Tyndale's translation remains intact in our present Bibles' [that is, the Authorized Version of 1611], and that 'his spirit animates the whole.'

English Church took the same line which she had taken two centuries before in the case of Wiclif's Bible. She objected, not to translations generally, but to unauthorized translations. The King was petitioned to have 'a translation made by good, learned, and Catholic persons'; and the business was entrusted to Cranmer, who was in his right sphere when conducting such a business. Everything seemed to be put in proper training, when the Vicar-General interfered with an injunction that every church should be provided with an English and Latin Bible; and, instead of the translation which was going on under Cranmer, and which was published in 1539, Miles Coverdale's version was imposed upon the Church, but was soon superseded.[1]

Many have thought that it would have been better if Henry had been content to rest on this general principle, that he meant to retain the Catholic faith, though he threw off the Roman Catholic yoke.[2] That faith is clearly enough defined in the three

[1] On May 6, 1541, was issued a Royal Proclamation (which then had the force of law) for 'the Bible of the largest and greatest volume to be had in every Church.'

[2] An able review in the *Guardian*, August 29, 1894, of 'The First Divorce of Henry VIII.,' by Mrs. Hope, puts the matter so forcibly that I venture to quote a passage from it: 'It is admitted among historians now that the whole quarrel between Henry VIII. and the Papacy was at bottom one of jurisdiction, and in no sense one of belief; that the principle upon which the Church of England was reformed in his reign was that of the right of a local Church to be part of the Catholic Church, and in communion with all parts of the Catholic Church, without acknowledging the supremacy of the Pope, just as, in a smaller way, the Church of South Africa is part of the Anglican communion, without in any way acknowledging the supremacy of the Archbishop of Canterbury.'

Catholic creeds; what need was there of further definitions? The answer to this question is that, amidst all these changes and controversies, the mass of the people were quite neglected, and had grown up grossly ignorant of the elementary truths of Christianity. The various documents, therefore, which were put forth in the later years of Henry's reign are not to be regarded as confessions of faith so much as means of instructing the people in matters in which, if they were to be Christians at all, they required to be instructed. First came the 'Ten Articles' of 1536, which begin by taking just the same ground which, as we have seen, was taken at the commencement of the Reformation. The Scriptures, as interpreted by the three creeds and the first four general councils, were to be the rule of faith, and then they enter into details. They were sanctioned by both Convocations, and were all embodied in the much fuller work which was put forth in the following year, 1537, entitled 'Institution of a Christian Man, containing the Exposition or Interpretation of the Common Creed, of the Seven Sacraments, of the Ten Commandments, and of the Pater Noster, and the Ave Maria, Justification and Purgatory.' It was popularly called the 'Bishops' Book,' because it was composed by a commission of bishops, including Cranmer, Lee, Stokesley, Tunstall, Gardiner, Latimer, Shaxton, Fox, Barlow, Hilsey, Rugge, and Goodrich, assisted by other divines. They describe their work as a 'plain and sincere doctrine concerning the whole sum of all those things which appertain unto the profession of a Christian man.' The work has been highly and deservedly praised as 'a noble endeavour on the

part of the bishops to promote unity and to instruct the people in Church doctrine,"[1] etc., and as 'a very admirable attempt to separate in a calm and reverent spirit Catholic truth from the admixture of Papal error.'[2] But though it draws a very marked and perfectly logical distinction between Catholicism and Roman Catholicism, it was probably intended to conciliate, as far as possible, the men of the old learning who had found a stumbling-block in the 'Ten Articles.' This party, however, was far more conciliated two years later. The rather injudicious introduction of some Lutheran divines into England roused in Henry that anti-Lutheran spirit which he had shown in print seventeen years before. This led to the enactment in 1539 of the cruel 'Law of the Six Articles' (drawn up, it is said, by Gardiner), or 'the whip with six thongs,' as it was called with only too good reason; for the acceptance of these six articles—that is, Transubstantiation, Communion in one kind, clerical celibacy, monastic vows, private Masses, and auricular confession—was enforced under the severest penalties. The 'Law of the Six Articles' was approved by Convocation,[3] and then sanctioned by Parliament through

[1] See 'Reformation of the Church of England,' by J. H. Blunt, pp. 444-469.

[2] Perry, p. 152. To these encomia it may be added that the 'Bishops' Book' is written in a very pure, luminous and dignified style, worthy of the great source from which it emanated.

[3] In this Convocation of 1539, Cromwell, the very man who had been the chief agent in the dissolution of Rome's greatest strongholds, was President as Vicegerent of the Head of the Church, and thus distinctly approved of the most reactionary measure in favour of Roman doctrine passed during the whole reign!

the personal interference of the King. In 1543 the Church was presented with another manual, called 'The King's Book,' or 'The Necessary Doctrine or Erudition of a Christian Man,' which came out with the authority of Convocation, and was, in fact, a careful revision of 'The Institution,' etc., with several important alterations which restored what had been discarded in the earlier manual. This was the last doctrinal manual which appeared in Henry's reign, but it should be added that, with the same view of bettering the spiritual condition of the masses, several primers were issued to supply them with books of private devotion. 'Marshall's Primer' was published before 1530, and reissued with alterations and additions in 1535. 'Hilsey's primer' was published under the authority of the Vicegerent, Cromwell, in 1539, and in 1545 both were superseded by the 'King's Primer,' or, to give it its full title, 'The Primer set forth by the King's Majesty and his Clergy to be taught, learned, and read; and none other to be used throughout all his dominions.' And, finally, it should be noted that, on June 11, 1544, by the command of the King, the English Litany in its present form, with a very few verbal differences, was put forth for public use. It had been sanctioned earlier in the same year by Convocation.

In 1547 King Henry VIII. died. His relations to the National Church had been of a strangely mixed character. On the one hand, he had been a barefaced robber of her property; he had crippled her immemorial right of ecclesiastical legislation; he had grossly outraged her moral laws; and he had introduced into her a grievous leaven of Erastianism.

But, on the other hand, he had, from whatever motives, vindicated her ancient independence, and delivered her from a foreign yoke; and had given her an open Bible, and, at any rate, the firstfruits of a liturgy in her own mother-tongue.

So much has been necessarily said of the spoliation that he wrought that it is a relief to record that one of the last acts of his reign was of a very different character. He had steadily resisted the many hints that had from time to time been given that college lands might be very conveniently confiscated as abbey lands had been, declaring that 'he judged no land better bestowed than that which was given to the Universities'; and he had acted fairly well up to that principle. The Regius professorships, both at Oxford and Cambridge, date from his reign, and he had, at any rate, not allowed Wolsey's magnificent design at Oxford to fall with its founder's fall, though he had sadly shorn its proportions. Just at the close of his life, chiefly through the influence of his last and best wife, he inaugurated an equally splendid foundation at Cambridge, the royal letters for the foundation of Trinity College being granted on December 19, 1546, only a few weeks before he passed away.

CHAPTER XIII.

THE REFORMATION PERIOD.

The Church in the Reign of Edward VI. (1547-1553).

Henry's last will not carried out—Government of Privy Council and Protector Somerset—Repeal of Treason Acts and 'Law of the Six Articles'—Seizure of chantries—Activity of Convocation—'Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum'—Visitation of the whole Church in accordance with royal injunctions—Transitional character of the period—Prayer-Book of 1549—Fall of Somerset and rise of Northumberland—Both Church-robbers—Influence of foreign Protestants—New bishops sympathized with their views—Hooper, Bishop of Gloucester—His influence over Edward VI.—Dominant party in Church and State—Objections made to the First Prayer-Book—Second Prayer-Book of 1552—First Book of Homilies and Paraphrases of Erasmus—Later laws of Edward VI.—The Forty-two Articles—The masses disliked the changes—Insurrections in various parts—Edward better than his surroundings—His charitable institutions—His death.

It was highly characteristic of King Henry, who called himself while living 'Supreme Head of the Church,' and who succeeded in having his own proclamations accepted as equivalent to Acts of Parliament, that he should desire still to reign after his death. His last will arranged how everything was to be managed; and it must be confessed that his arrangements were by no means unwise. He foresaw that in the unsettled state of affairs, and the remarkable lack of men of ability and high principle, there was only too likely to be a general scramble,

making confusion worse confounded. When the hand which had held the reins so tightly for nearly forty years was removed, who was strong enough to guide the vehicle of Church and State on the right course? His son, who, so far as we can gather, appears to have inherited much of the strong will and strong intellect of his father, might in time have been able to do so, but he was yet a mere child of nine years of age. So Henry appointed a council of eighteen, who, with the aid of twelve assistants, were to manage temporarily the affairs of the kingdom; but no statute which should be passed while the young King was yet a minor was to be binding upon him, unless it was confirmed by himself when he came of age. Everything was neatly arranged—upon paper; but it was scarcely to be expected that this neat arrangement would be scrupulously carried out. It was one thing to submit to a masterful tyrant, who could enforce his will under the severest pains and penalties—quite another to comply with the wishes of that tyrant when he lay still and powerless in his grave. So there was hardly a semblance of carrying out the desires of the late King. The government fell practically into the hands of the Privy Council. The King's maternal uncle, Edward Seymour, Earl of Hertford, became Duke of Somerset and Protector of the kingdom, and for nearly three years he was King in all but name. So far from virtually suspending its functions, as the late King's will suggested, the Legislature was exceptionally active during the six years of Edward VI.'s short reign. Parliament met on November 4, and Convocation, which had been silenced since 1544, on the same day. Before

Christmas the Parliament had passed a number of measures deeply affecting the Church. The first was against the revilers of the Blessed Sacrament (a most necessary measure in that irreverent time), and for receiving it in both kinds. Then followed the abolition of the *congé d'élire* for the election of bishops, which had long been a farce; then the repeal of the Treason Acts and of the 'Law of the Six Articles,' which was most desirable, for the Acts repealed had been among the most tyrannical and cruel laws of Henry's reign. Next came an important Act which provided that the property of all chantries and guilds should be given to the King. This was a continuation of the legislation under the late King, whose death occurred before the Act granting to him the chantries could be put into force. Many of the chantries had surrendered before the final sentence came,[1] and when it did come it was not on account of any abuses which existed, but simply as part of the new reform that was going on. The revenues of the chantries were to be 'diverted from the work of offering Masses for the dead to good and godly uses'—in other words, to the foundation of grammar schools. About eighteen or twenty of such schools were established, which are still known as 'King Edward VI.'s schools'; but these barely made up for the schools which were suppressed, for many of the chantries had been themselves educational establishments. The bishops were opposed to this application of the money; even Cranmer, though a friend of the Reformation, would have preferred to see it devoted to the relief of the

[1] Twenty-two are said to have surrendered between the years 1541 and 1547.

extensive poverty of the secular clergy. This seizure of the chantries was, in the quaint language of Fuller, 'the last dish of the course. After chantries, as after cheese, nothing is to be expected.' But the coping-stone was put on the vast fabric of spoliation by sending commissioners to visit all the cathedral and parish churches, and seize the superfluous plate and ornaments for the King's use. The last Act of the session was a General Pardon, but one to which there were to be some notable exceptions.

Convocation was as busy as Parliament. The Archbishop opened the proceedings by urging the clergy to 'prosecute the work of reformation, that so the Church might be discharged of all Popish trash not yet thrown out.' The clergy made the obvious reply that they dared not set about such work while the terrible 'Law of the Six Articles' was still in force; but this difficulty was soon removed, and in their next session (November 25) the Lower House responded to the Archbishop's appeal, though not, perhaps, quite in the way in which he intended. They sent up four petitions to the Upper House, which showed that they were anxious for reform, but not so much in the line of discharging 'Popish trash,' as of claiming their own constitutional rights. The petitions were: (1) That the Committee of Thirty-two be revived; (2) that the clergy be present, according to the ancient writ, in Parliament; (3) that the work of the committee on Church services be laid before them; and (4) that some mitigation of annates be allowed. In accordance with the first petition, the Committee of Thirty-two was revived by Act of Parliament in 1549, and produced the well-known 'Reformatio Legum

Ecclesiasticarum,'[1] which was an attempt to reform the pre-Reformation canons, and bring them into harmony with Reformation principles. The work was finished, but the King died before it received his confirmation, so it never became law. Out of the third grew the great work of the reign, so far as the Church was concerned, viz., the English Prayer-Book of 1549. In a later session Convocation unanimously authorized the restoration of the Holy Communion in both kinds to the laity, and at their last session they decided against the compulsory celibacy of priests. In fact, Convocation was now of the utmost importance; it proved, as Archdeacon Perry justly observes, 'a salutary check to ultra-reformers,' who, if left to themselves, would probably have succeeded in destroying the distinctive character of the Church of England in one direction, just as Bishop Bonner, if left to *himself*, would have destroyed it in another.

But the chances of Rome were more hopeless than ever. Cardinal Pole seems to have fully expected that a reaction in favour of Romanism would take place, and that he would be at the head of affairs; but he did not understand the English character. The people might care little for points of doctrine, but they were almost unanimous in their determination to reject the authority of the Pope.[2] Pole, on the contrary, was willing to go far with the Protestants on doctrinal points, but he made his stand on the spiritual suzerainty of the Pope. In reply to

[1] Its full title is 'Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum ex Auctoritate Regis Henry VIII. inchoata et per Edward VI. provecta.'

[2] See Hook's 'Pole,' ch. iv., pp. 194, 195.

his letter to Mary on her accession, she warned him that the very opposite was the prevalent feeling in England.[1]

An event of great importance to the Church was the appointment of a commission for a royal visitation of the whole Church, corresponding in its character to that royal visitation of the monasteries which Henry held through his Vicar-General, though happily differing in its results. The ordinary jurisdiction of the Archbishop was suspended by a Privy Council mandate, just as it had been suspended by royal mandate for the visitation of the monasteries. The visitation was to be conducted in accordance with the injunctions of Edward VI., those injunctions owing their authority to the statute which made the King's proclamation equivalent to an Act of Parliament. There were thirty commissioners, and they were divided into six companies. The visitors took with them copies of the Homilies, which were to be used in place of sermons, and they left in each church a body of injunctions which had the force of Acts of Parliament. These injunctions were all in favour of the 'new learning,' and therefore it is not surprising that the bishops of the 'old learning' should have set their faces against them. Bishops Bonner and Gardiner were both sent to prison for refusing to receive them, but both were released by the General Pardon of 1548. Gardiner plainly said that he could not receive the Privy Council as King, and was of opinion that, in accordance with the spirit of Henry's will, no law about religion should be changed while the King was a minor; Bonner consented to receive the in-

[1] Hook's 'Pole,' ch. iv., p. 223.

junctions and the Homilies 'if they were not repugnant to the laws of God and the Church,' but he plainly intimated that he thought they *were* repugnant.

We are now in the midst of a transition period, and several curious instances occur illustrative of its transitional character. We find one in the proclamation which was issued for the observance of Lent in accordance with the Act concerning abstinence of 1548. The season was to be observed 'for the benefit of men's health and for the good of the fisheries.' We find another in the issue, in this same year, 1548, of a catechism called 'Cranmer's Catechism,' which was in reality only a translation of a translation, the real author being Jonas Justus, the German Lutheran. The catechism distinctly inculcates the doctrine of the Real Presence in the Holy Eucharist, the power of the keys, and Apostolical succession; but to conciliate the advanced reformers a picture of the Last Supper is substituted for one of a priest celebrating the Mass in vestments.

It was probably in order that some settlement might be arrived at as soon as possible that the divines assembled at Windsor[1] were eager to bring out their new Prayer-Book even before the whole work was completed. The labours of this Windsor commission were the most satisfactory of the ecclesiastical doings in this reign. The workers seem to have thoroughly understood the true position of the English Church; they worked faithfully and consistently on the lines of retaining all that was primi-

[1] These were: Cranmer, Ridley, Goodrich, Holbeach, Skip, Thirlby, Day, Taylor, Cox, May, Robertson, Heynes and Redmayne.

tive and Catholic, and rejecting all that was merely mediæval or new-fangled on either side. The result of their work, which went on unceasing during the year 1548, came out piecemeal. First appeared the new Communion Office, which was authorized before the close of 1548, 'till June 9, 1549, when other order should be provided.' Then came the whole of the First Prayer-Book of Edward VI., with the exception of the Ordinal, which was not yet finished. The sources from which the first English Liturgy was constructed were, first and chiefly, the old service-books, which in many respects could not be improved upon; secondly, the 'Breviary of Cardinal Quignon'; and thirdly, the 'Consultations of Archbishop Hermann.' The book superseded the various uses which had hitherto prevailed, and was adopted throughout the country. The commissioners had submitted their work, first to Convocation, who, having sanctioned it in both Houses, sent it to the King in Council; then the Council laid it before Parliament; Parliament incorporated it into the First Act of Uniformity. On Whitsunday, 1549, it began to be used generally,[1] and in 1550 the Ordinal appeared.

If the work of Reformation had proceeded on the lines marked out in this Prayer-Book, a satisfactory settlement might have been attained much earlier than it was; but in the year 1550 a reaction set in which again threw matters into confusion. One can scarcely help connecting this reaction with the fall of the Protector Somerset, which occurred in this year. No right-minded man, least of all a good

[1] It was used in some of the London churches on Easter Day, 1549.

Churchman, will justify the conduct of the Protector who ruled England for nearly three years after the death of Henry VIII. His position was a usurped one, and, like most usurpers, he had to wade his way into power through blood, including in his case the blood of his own brother. He was a glaring and unblushing church-robber, setting an example which others were only too ready to follow. Somerset House, or, as it was then called, Somerset Place, still remains as a standing monument of his rapacity. In order to provide materials for building it, he pulled down the Church of S. Mary-le-Strand and three bishops' houses, and was proceeding also to pull down the historical church of S. Margaret, Westminster; but public opinion was too strong against him, the parishioners 'rose and beat off his workmen,' and he was forced to desist, and content himself with violating and plundering the precincts of S. Paul's. He turned Glastonbury, with all its unique associations dating from the earliest introduction of Christianity into our island, into a worsted manufactory, managed by French Protestants! Under his auspices the splendid college of S. Martin-le-Grand in London was converted into a tavern, and S. Stephen's Chapel, Westminster, served the scarcely less incongruous purpose of a Parliament House. But, in spite of all this, it was no gain, but rather a distinct loss, when Somerset's place was virtually filled by John Dudley, Earl of Warwick, and afterwards Duke of Northumberland, who had always been his rival, and who succeeded in compassing his ruin just after the First Prayer-Book had been sanctioned.

The work of spoliation went on at least as rapidly

after as it had done before the fall of Somerset. Mr. Froude, who will certainly not be suspected of any 'High Church' prejudices, thus describes the work of sacrilege: 'In the autumn and winter of 1552-53 no less than four commissions were appointed with this one object [of spoliation], four of whom were to go over the often-trodden ground and glean the last spoils which could be gathered from the churches. In the business of plunder the rapacity of the Crown officials had been far distanced hitherto by private peculation. The halls of country houses were hung with altar cloths; tables and beds were quilted with copes; the knights and squires drank their claret out of chalices, and watered their horses in marble coffins,' and so on.[1]

The fall of Somerset synchronized with a Puritan reaction which bade fair to obliterate the lines on which the Reformation, with many temporary deflections, was carried out in England. There was an influx of foreign Protestants, whose object was to fashion the Church of England after the model of Zurich or Geneva. Cranmer, who had married a niece of Osiander, Pastor of Nuremberg, had a strong leaning to these foreign Protestants, who not only gained a footing in England, but were in some instances appointed to posts in which they would have exceptional opportunities of disseminating their views. The Regius Professorships of Divinity at both Universities were conferred upon foreigners: that at Cambridge upon Bucer, that at Oxford upon Peter Martyr. The Regius Professorship of Hebrew at Cambridge was held, first by Fagius, and then by John Emmanuel Tremellis, a converted Jew. Valer-

[4] See Froude's 'History of England,' vol. v., p. 458.

andus Pollanus, minister of the French Protestant refugees at Glastonbury, and John à Lasco, both extreme men, also took an active part in Church reform in the country where they were settled; and Bullinger, perhaps the strongest man of all, though he was not present in person, held frequent correspondence with the party, and had great influence over it. Melancthon could not be induced by Cranmer to visit England, and, if he had, he would have been too mild and moderate to suit the purposes of the rest.

This foreign element which was introduced into the councils of the Church of England exactly harmonized with the sentiments of most of the new bishops who had taken the places of those who had been deprived. The important see of London, vacant by the deprivation of Bonner, was filled by Matthew Ridley, who had been Cranmer's chaplain and protégé, but was a far more determined, and perhaps a more learned, man than his patron. As Bishop of Rochester he had signalized himself by pulling down the altars, and setting up what were contemptuously called 'oyster-tables' in their room. Ponet, first at Rochester and then at Winchester, Holbeach and Taylor, successively Bishops of Lincoln, Miles Coverdale of Exeter, and Harley of Hereford, were all reformers of the foreign type. There were others who never reached the Bench, but whose high characters and activity lent force to the same side. Among these were the excellent Rowland Taylor, of Hadleigh in Suffolk, who laid down his life for his opinions in the next reign; John Bradford, the chaplain and trusted friend of Ridley, who also sealed his faith with his blood; and perhaps we may

add the apostolic Bernard Gilpin, of Houghton-le-Spring, who was the most effective preacher of the Reformation in the North. But the most uncompromising and most extreme of all was John Hooper, who anticipated the later type of Puritan of the days of Elizabeth. Hooper had been driven into foreign exile by the persecuting 'Law of the Six Articles,' and had thoroughly imbibed the spirit of the foreign Reformation. On the repeal of that law he returned to England, where he found many more sympathizers than he had met with before he left his home. In 1550 he became chaplain to the Protector Somerset, and was leader of the advanced reformers, lecturing twice a day in London churches to enormous auditories. He was offered by Warwick, Somerset's successor, the bishopric of Gloucester. He was ready to accept it, but he refused to be consecrated in the 'Aaronic habits.' Cranmer, however, was firm on this point, and Hooper at last consented to assume for the ceremony the obnoxious garments.[1] But though a Bishop in dress, he still remained a Puritan at heart, and took the part of energetic leader of the extreme reformers. Early in 1552 the see of Worcester was given him to hold *in commendam* with Gloucester, but it was at Gloucester that he was most active and made the deepest impression. In 1550 he completely won over a youthful but important ally in the boy King. He preached a course of Lenten sermons before Edward, who was very impressible, and who, under Hooper's influence, warmly identified himself with the party of the extreme reformers, to which he had always

[1] Bullinger says he heard of Hooper's consent to wear the vestments 'non sine dolore.'

leaned. That party took objection to the new Prayer-Book, especially the Communion office, and they spent the whole of 1551 in reviewing the book, under the guidance of Hooper. They found little opposition either in Church or State; the Bench had been purged of those bishops who would have been most inclined to oppose it. Gardiner and Bonner were deprived; Tunstall had been removed from Durham, for the simple but sufficient reason that Dudley desired to seize the revenues of the see; Heath had been deprived of Worcester, and Day of Chichester, because they would not carry out the command to sweep away altars and images. The dominant party in the State, of which Dudley was the head, were quite in favour of the dominant party in the Church, being convinced, not by theological arguments, but by the *argumentum ad crumenam*. The greater the simplicity, not to say bareness, of the accessories of worship, the greater would be the spoils that fell to them. Altars, with their rich adornments and vestments, were expensive, but 'oyster-tables' and Geneva cloaks were uncommonly cheap; so the Court party were in heartfelt sympathy with the reform party. The question of the revision of the First Prayer-Book was brought before Convocation in 1550, and in 1552 the Second Prayer-Book appeared, bearing traces of the foreign influence which was at work among the English reformers. It was imposed by a second Act of Uniformity, and was to come into use on All Saints' Day. But within a few months of that day the King died, and all the ecclesiastical laws of his reign were repealed; and so it is very doubtful whether the Second Prayer-Book ever was generally used,

though it was adopted by Bishop Ridley at St. Paul's, and probably by others at some leading churches. The people at large were not over-well satisfied with the changes introduced into their old religion by the First Prayer-Book, and they were still less inclined to welcome the greater changes introduced by the Second; and the clergy as a body were in no great hurry to obey the new law.

But the Second Prayer-Book was not the only result of the efforts of the new reforming party. The First Book of Homilies was put forth in 1547, and a translation of the Paraphrases of Erasmus. The Homilies were ordered by the King to be read every Sunday in the churches. The Paraphrases had been translated from Latin into the vernacular, partly by Catharine, the Queen-dowager, and partly by the Princess Mary—of all people in the world!

Some of the ecclesiastical laws which were passed in the later Parliaments of Edward VI. were obviously desirable. It is sad enough to think that a law against fighting in churches should have been necessary, but, considering the example of irreverence for sacred places and sacred things set, as we have seen, by men in high position, we can well believe that it was; and if so, it was desirable that the law should be made. So again, if clerical marriages were to be allowed, it was only fair that the stigma attaching to the offspring of such marriages should be removed; and there is nothing to be said against the Act which legitimatized the children of priests. Nor is it, in my opinion, quite fair to brand as a purely Erastian Act that which required the bishops to procure new licenses from the Crown, *durante benè placito*. For a distinction

must surely be drawn between the office of a Bishop and his right of jurisdiction in any particular place; the former the secular power can neither confer nor take away; but the latter it can, and, if the Royal Supremacy be admitted, it must. The requirement of new licenses might have been vexatious, it might have been intended as a slur upon the clergy, who were not in favour with the Privy Council Government; but it was not an infringement upon the spiritual power.

In fact, to tell the truth, the spiritual power was more in danger from the action of its natural guardians than from that of the secular arm. We really have to thank the foreign reformers themselves for saving us, as a Church, from endless confusion; for if the proposal of Cranmer to join with Calvin, Bullinger and Melancthon in framing a United Confession of Faith, which was to be a sort of counterblast to the decisions of the Council of Trent, had been accepted, it must have landed us in a most awkward predicament. Cranmer advised the King to this step, and, from what we know of Edward's sentiments, we may well believe that he would have taken the advice; but, happily, the proposal was received with marked coldness by Calvin, and it came to nothing. Cranmer had to be content with a confession of faith emanating only from the Church of England. The Forty-two Articles, which were substantially the same as our Thirty-nine,[1] were approved by Convocation towards the

[1] There is, however, one very significant difference. The whole of Article XLII., which committed the Church of England to an express opinion as to the irreparable state of those who died impenitent, was excised.

close of 1552,[1] and published by royal license early in 1553. Cranmer and Ridley had the chief share in their composition.

It will be observed that hitherto we have been speaking of kings and nobles, prelates and dignitaries; but the question arises, How did the main body of the nation, priests and people, like these constant changes in religious doctrine, discipline, and worship? The answer is, Not at all; and naturally so. *They* derived no benefit from the dissolution of monasteries, the suppression of chantries, the confiscation of episcopal and other church revenues, the impropriation of tithes, the changing of altars into tables, and the removing of images. Without attributing to them any exalted religious motives, still less any devoted attachment to the Church of Rome, we can yet quite understand that they would strongly object to the diversion of what was *their* heritage to the enrichment of the Dudleys and others about Court. There were also thousands of dispossessed monks, scattered about the country, complaining loudly that their pensions were irregularly paid, and always ready to foment any dissatisfaction; while on the other side there was a party of Anabaptists whose principles were purely socialistic.

Hence, all things considered, it is no wonder that very serious insurrections occurred in different parts of the land. Northamptonshire and the Midland counties were in a state of ferment; Yorkshire was preparing for another rising. The people of Devonshire and Cornwall, where some of the clergy

[1] That is, on March 2, 1552, according to the then reckoning, 1553 according to our reckoning.

were reduced to absolute beggary, made a formal demand for the restitution of the old practices to which they had been used; and the inhabitants of Cornwall, at any rate, would not be much pacified by being told that they had got the Bible and the Liturgy in English, inasmuch as they neither spoke nor understood the English language.[1] There was a formidable rising in Norfolk and Suffolk under the leadership of one Kett, a tanner, and the Eastern counties generally followed the example. It may be that the enclosure of commons had as much to do with the discontent as the religious changes; but both alike would seem parts of the same system, which was regarded, not without reason, as a general system of robbery of the poor by the *nouveaux riches* —not the old county families, who had almost died out.

Meanwhile the poor little boy King, who was really better than his surroundings, was fast approaching his end. No spirit of grasping selfishness had shown itself in him. On the contrary, he had given indications of a very feeling heart. Moved by a sermon of Bishop Ridley in June, 1553, only a few months before his death, he had founded institutions for the benefit of those who had been 'impoverished either by impotency, or by casualty, or by extravagance.' For the first he provided the noble institution of Christ's Hospital; for the second he transferred the revenues which had accrued from the dissolution of the Savoy Palace to the foundation of S. Thomas's

[1] When some were offended, because the book was not in the Cornish language, the King asked, 'Why should they now be offended more, when they understand it not in English, than when they had it in Latin, and understood it not?'

Hospital and S. Bartholomew's Hospital; for the last he provided Bridewell to be a workhouse for 'ramblers, dissolute persons, and sturdy beggars.' Within a month he was dying of pulmonary consumption at Greenwich, having been persuaded, by those who ought to have known better, to appoint a successor who had no legal title whatever, and was quite certain not to be accepted. He left the Church in a very different position from that in which he found it at his accession, but quite as far off from any permanent settlement.

CHAPTER XIV.

THE TUDOR PERIOD.

The Church in the Reign of Queen Mary I. (1553-1558).

Mary's religious views not generally unpopular at first—Her early Church policy—Clergy as a body not opposed to her—Her severe provocations from reformers—Her first proclamation—Deprivation and attainder of Cranmer—Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer put upon their trial for heresy—Pole made Archbishop of Canterbury—Gardiner the most influential ecclesiastic in the country—Conference at Oxford between men of old and new learning—The Spanish match the turning-point of the reign—Pole as Papal Legate reconciles the English Church with Rome—Issues a commission for trial of heretics—The Marian persecution—John Rogers, its protomartyr—Hooper, its first episcopal victim—Rowland Taylor—John Bradford—Commissioners accused of slackness—Gardiner retired from chairmanship of commission, and Bonner succeeded him—Even Bonner had to be urged to greater severity—Both Church and State urged on by Queen and King—Most burnings in diocese of London—Then in that of Canterbury—Then Norwich—Ridley and Latimer burnt at Oxford—Cranmer reserved till he was excommunicated by Pope—Tempted and recanted six times—His brave end—Death of Queen—Persecution (1) made return to Roman obedience impossible, (2) strengthened extreme reform party—Mary had a real, though a perverted, sense of duty.

It was only to be expected that on the accession of Mary an entire reversal of the ecclesiastical policy which had prevailed during her brother's reign would immediately take place. Nor would such a reversal be so difficult as might at first sight appear. As has

been shown in the last chapter, the nation at large had never heartily accepted the various changes in religion which had been introduced in the reign of Edward VI. From the times of Ethelbert and Edwin downwards, it had always been the tradition of the English people to follow the religion of their Sovereign. It was thus that the land had been gradually converted to Christianity. It required a very strong provocation to make the English violate this tradition; and this fact lends an additional significance to such risings as the Pilgrimage of Grace in King Henry's reign, and those in Devonshire, Cornwall, Norfolk, and other counties in King Edward's. It appears to me that Mary's subjects were to a great extent ready to return with her to their old religion. The utter abortiveness of the attempt to put Lady Jane Grey, or rather Dudley, on the throne, in the interests of Protestantism, is an indication of this. The rising in Suffolk under Sir Thomas Wyatt may seem an indication of the contrary; but this really was not so much a religious rising as a protest against the projected Spanish match; and whatever it was, it was quite insignificant, and easily put down.

The measures taken in the early part of the new Queen's reign in regard to the Church were what everybody must have expected. The bishops who had been deprived and punished for maintaining the same principles which the Queen herself advocated were restored; the first ecclesiastical act of the new reign was to liberate Gardiner from the Tower, Bonner from the Marshalsea, Tunstall from the King's Bench, and Heath, Day, and Voysey from their respective places of confinement, and to re-

store them all to their sees. This involved the ejection of the bishops in possession, Ponet, Ridley, Coverdale, Scory, and Hooper,[1] which was hard upon individuals, but inevitable. Mary's first Parliament refused to repeal any of the Acts relating to the Church which had been passed in the reign of Henry VIII., and a considerable minority even stood out against the repeal of the Ecclesiastical Acts passed in the reign of his son. These, however, were overruled; and it was agreed that the form of service used in the last year of Henry should be the only legal service, and that the Church generally should return to the state in which it then was.

Convocation was, as a body, more in sympathy with the new Queen's views than Parliament was.[2] This is easily accounted for. The party in Convocation which would have opposed her was thinned out, partly by the deprivation of the married clergy, (a very sweeping measure), partly by the flight of the most extreme of the reformers to the Continent. Moreover, the parochial clergy, who had suffered the most severely from the spoilers who called themselves reformers in the late reigns, took care to return no representatives in favour of reform. So,

[1] Hooper, it will be remembered, virtually held two sees, Gloucester with Worcester *in commendam;* hence only five would have to be ejected to make room for six.

[2] It has, however, been emphatically denied that this Convocation can be fairly regarded as a provincial synod of the Church of England. Its proper president, the Archbishop of Canterbury, who had not been deprived by any synodical decision, was a prisoner in the Tower, and the deprivation of so large a body of the clergy prevented it from being a really representative assembly.

of the very few who may be said to have formed the opposition, not one was a proctor for the clergy. Aylmer, Archdeacon of Stow, who had been tutor to Lady Jane Grey, Philpot, Archdeacon of Winchester, and Cheney, Archdeacon of Hereford, were the chief speakers on that side. The Lower House passed, with only five dissentients, four Articles, which have a melancholy interest, as they afterwards became the tests of heresy, the refusal to accept them involving the punishment of death. The Articles assert: (1) The sufficiency of Communion in one kind; (2) the doctrine of Transubstantiation; (3) the duty of worshipping Christ in the Elements; (4) the Unbloody Sacrifice.

The new Queen had certainly suffered severe provocations which might all be put down to the score of the reformed faith. Her mother had been subjected to indignities of a kind the hardest of all for a woman to bear; a slur had been cast upon her own legitimacy; she had been treated with harshness, not to say actual cruelty, after her ill-used mother's death; and all this was connected with the introduction of what she would call heresy. The low coarseness of the Ribalds, who in her father's time had poured forth in rank luxuriance their pamphlets against things which to her mind would appear most sacred, must have exasperated her beyond endurance.[1] Add to all this that she was already more than half a Spaniard, having been trained by a Spanish mother, having had little cause to love or respect her English father, and having taken as her trusted counsellor her Spanish relative, Charles V., who thought it actually wrong to keep faith with heretics,

[1] See Dr. S. Maitland's essay on 'The Ribalds.'

and it will not appear surprising that she should have acted as she did, when by a turn of the wheel of fortune the power came into her hands. In her first proclamation (August, 1553), she said, reasonably enough, that 'though she could not now hide that religion which God and the world knew she had ever professed from her infancy hitherto, yet she minded not to compel any of her subjects thereto until such time as further order by common consent might be taken therein.' Read in the light of after-events, there is an ominous significance in this last clause, which distinguished it from the unconditional promise she had given previously to the people of Suffolk that she would not disturb their religion. But in the first year of her reign there really was little but what might have been expected from her known principles. Her Church policy was, professedly, to go back to the state of affairs in the last year of King Henry VIII. And this was natural. The doings of a doubtful council under a royal minority might well be ignored. It had always been the view of Gardiner and many others that no religious change should be made till the King came of age; and as the King never *did* come of age, matters naturally reverted to the position they were in at the time of Henry's death.

The deprivation and attainder of Cranmer can hardly be regarded as an exceptional act of cruelty. The Queen has been charged with ingratitude for not remembering that the Archbishop had once interceded with her father for her life; but apart from that he had been her enemy on every possible occasion. It was Cranmer who had given the fatal advice by which her mother's divorce had become

feasible; who had been her father's chief agent all through the odious proceedings; who had held the mock trial at Dunstable, and at last pronounced the formal sentence of divorce. He had given the sanction of his high name and position to the mad attempt to exclude her from the throne; he had identified himself with the party which had been most of all opposed to her religion. He was deprived of his jurisdiction and attainted by Parliament as a traitor. He was found guilty, but his life was spared by the clemency of the Queen, though he was soon after put upon his trial for heresy. The same measure was dealt to Ridley, who had also identified himself with the cause of Lady Jane Grey, preaching in favour of her succession at S. Paul's Cross, and also to Latimer.

The archbishopric of Canterbury continued vacant until the consecration of Cardinal Pole in 1556, and Gardiner, who, besides being restored to Winchester, was appointed Lord Chancellor of England, was now the most influential ecclesiastic in the country. He remained firm to his policy of leaving everything for the present as it was at the close of Henry VIII.'s reign. This quite accorded with the Queen's wishes, who desired to have nothing done until the arrival of the Papal Legate from Rome. There were to be, indeed, solemn discussions at the two Universities between the men of the old learning and the men of the new, in which the latter were to be ignominiously defeated. Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer were sent to Oxford to represent the heretical side; Hooper, Rogers, Philpot, Bradford, Crewe and Taylor were reserved to play the same unenviable part at Cambridge. The Oxford discussion

took place at S. Mary's Church, with the prearranged result, and Cranmer, Ridley and Latimer were condemned as heretics by the royal commission. But the Cambridge discussion does not appear to have come off. All this, however, was comparatively child's play; but it was soon to be followed by only too serious a treatment of the vitally important questions in dispute.

The turning-point was the fatal Spanish match. On July 25, 1554, Queen Mary, in spite of the loudly-expressed disapproval of her subjects, in spite of the advice of her best friends, in spite of the disparity of years, and the obvious indifference of her suitor, married her cousin,[1] Philip of Spain, son of the Emperor Charles V. Philip brought with him to England a party of Spanish priests, who played a painfully conspicuous part in the scenes which soon ensued. Among these were a Dominican, Peter de Soto, confessor of Charles V., whom the Queen appointed Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford, in the room of Peter Martyr; Villagarcia, another Dominican, who was also sent to indoctrinate Oxford by reading lectures in divinity at Lincoln and Magdalen Colleges; Alphonso de Castro, who was called *par excellence* 'Philip's preacher'; and Carranza, who became confessor to the Queen, and, long afterwards, the biographer of her husband, Philip.

November, 1554, was a memorable month. The Queen issued instructions to her Council to prepare them for the speedy arrival of the Papal Legate, Cardinal Pole; and in these instructions she gave

[1] That is, first cousin once removed. Mary, of course, belonged to the older generation, and had actually been betrothed in her youth to Philip's father, Charles, her first cousin.

a plain hint of the persecution which was about to ensue. She declared that 'especially in London she would have none to be burnt without some of the Council's presence, and a good sermon at the same.' This, be it observed, was before the meeting of Parliament, and therefore before the burning of heretics had been made lawful. Then the long-looked-for Legate arrived, bringing with him a Bull from the Pope authorizing him to transfer to the present holders all monastic and church property which had been granted or sold to laymen. This relieved the minds of many, who cared little what religion prevailed, so long as their property, which they had acquired from the spoliation of the Church, was safe. In return for this gracious gift of other people's money, the Parliament sanctioned the desired revival of the laws against heresy, and the tragedy soon began.

There was no need to frame fresh laws. The odious statute of Henry IV., *De Hæretico Comburendo* (re-enacted in the times of Henry V. and VI.), sanctioned the burning of reformers no less than of Lollards. It had been repealed in the time of Henry VIII. (25 Hen. VIII., c. xvi.), and was now re-enacted.

First, however, a touching ceremony took place. Both Houses of Parliament had sent a humble address to the King and the Queen, begging them to intercede with the Legate for their absolution, so that they might be received as obedient children into the bosom of the Church. The address was graciously received; the absolution was granted, and S. Andrew's Day was set apart, and was for ever to be observed as the Feast of Reconciliation.

Within a few weeks more serious work began. On

January 29 the Cardinal Legate issued a commission to Bishops Gardiner, Tunstall, Capon, and Thirlby, to proceed to the trial of heretics, and the episcopal commission met at S. Saviour's (S. Mary Overy), Southwark. They do not appear to have relished their task, but they had no alternative. The first two who were brought before them were John Rogers, Prebendary of S. Paul's and Vicar of S. Sepulchre's, and Bishop Hooper. Both had been chosen champions of the heretical side at the mock conference which was to have been held at Cambridge. Rogers was the first to be condemned and handed over to the secular arm, and he has thus the honour of being the protomartyr in the Marian persecution.[1] The case against Hooper was even more glaring. He had been the leader of the extreme left of the reform party, and he was the last man in the world to lower his colours. Gardiner in vain strove to induce him to submit, and to receive the Pope's blessing. He was firm, and thus he became the first of the episcopal victims. It was arranged that the heretics should suffer on the spots with which they had been connected in the time of their power. It was thought, perhaps, that the spectacle of their sufferings would

[1] The term 'protomartyr' is used by Dr. Lingard, who sets an example of fairness which has been, happily, copied by other Roman Catholic historians. Speaking of Bishop Hooper and three others who perished at the stake in February, 1554-55, he says: 'They were the protomartyrs of the reformed Church of England.' There would be a special reason for attacking Rogers, if, as there is every reason to believe, he was identical with the mysterious Matthews, who gave the name to 'Matthews' Bible.' On his trial he was arraigned as 'John Rogers *alias* Matthews.' See Milman's 'Annals of S. Paul's Cathedral,' ch. x., pp. 241, 242.

act as a wholesome warning to those who had been under their spell. But if so, it was a most mistaken idea. The result was, rather, to turn trusted leaders into glorified martyrs, in whose steps their followers were bound, in point of honour as well as principle, to walk even unto death. Hooper was burned February 9, 1554-55, amid circumstances of sickening horror, at Gloucester, in which city he had a large following, and the spot henceforth became a sacred spot, ever reminding those who had once sat at his feet to be firm in the faith which he had sealed with his blood.

This mistaken policy was still more strikingly illustrated in the case of another victim. Few men were more generally respected than Dr. Rowland Taylor, who was fondly termed 'the parson of Hadleigh.' He had spent his energies, not so much upon controversy as upon good practical work among his simple parishioners at Hadleigh, or Hadley, in Suffolk; but he was firm and uncompromising in his opinions, and had strongly opposed the intrusion of a strange priest to say Masses in the church where he had so long officiated. For this he was brought before Gardiner, as Lord Chancellor. He was committed to the King's Bench, and deprived of his benefice for being married. After two years' imprisonment he was brought before the Southwark commissioners, and condemned to be burnt at Hadleigh, the scene of his labours, in the sight of those who had known him and loved him; and thus Hadleigh became, like Gloucester, a rallying-point for the opponents of Roman cruelty. The same result ensued from the condemnation of Lawrence Saunders, Rector of All Hallows', Broad

Street, who was sentenced to be burnt at Coventry, because he had once exercised his ministerial functions in that city.

But even the fate of Rowland Taylor scarcely created so much sympathy and indignation as that of John Bradford, whose saintly and ascetic life rendered him worthy of canonization. Bishop Ridley, whose domestic chaplain he had been, said of him after his death: 'I thank God heartily that ever I was acquainted with our dear brother Bradford, and that ever I had such an one in my house.' He is one of Foxe's most notable heroes, and even Parsons the Jesuit owns that 'he was of a more soft and mild nature than many of his fellows.' But, though a man of singularly gentle character, Bradford had been a very vigorous and bold preacher, not fearing to rebuke the vices of the great, nor yet to reprove his own friends when he thought them wrong.[1] Like Rogers, the protomartyr, he was a Prebendary of St. Paul's, and had been chaplain-in-ordinary to the late King. So he was too prominent a man to escape notice, and he could not abide the test of the commissioners. In January, 1554, he was condemned as an obstinate heretic. It was at first intended to burn him at Manchester, his native town; but he had of late years been more connected with London; so, after a year and a half's delay, on July 1, 1555, 'was he led forth to Smithfield with a

[1] He preached strongly at St. Mary-le-Bow Church, Cheapside, against the maltreatment of Gilbert Bourne, who, after a sermon praising Mary and inveighing against Edward VI., shortly after the Queen's accession, would have been torn to pieces by the populace had he not been rescued by Bradford and Rogers.

great company of men to conduct him thither, as the like was not seen at no man's burning, for in every corner of Smithfield there were some, besides those who stood about the stake' (Foxe).

But, after all, the work of the commission did not go on fast enough to please the Council; and they wrote to the episcopal commissioners accusing them of slackness. The sharp remonstrance seems to have roused Bonner, who had now taken the place of Gardiner as chairman of the commission. Gardiner had never thrown himself heartily into the work, and had now retired altogether. Bonner was really the only Bishop who can at all fairly be accused of bloodthirstiness; he committed no less than 128 persons to the flames, and was in the habit of making coarse jokes and unworthy taunts before condemning them.[1] But even Bonner was urged on from without to be more cruel than his own inclination would have led him to be. This was shown in the case of one of his victims who has left us his own account of the proceedings. Philpot, Archdeacon of Winchester, has already been mentioned as one of the dauntless five who lifted up their voices in the first Convocation against those four Articles which afterwards became the test of heresy. He had been a Fellow of New College, and was evidently a man of considerable culture; though an Oxford man, he was to have been one of the champions of the reformers at the

[1] It is no real justification of Bonner's cruelty that he had been cruelly used himself; but it will account in some measure for his bitterness. Dean Milman, having vividly described how Bonner was treated, especially in his own cathedral of S. Paul's in the time of Edward VI., remarks: 'Verily, if anything can excuse Bonner, it is this persecution.' See Milman, 'Annals of S. Paul's Cathedral,' ch. ix., pp. 223-225.

mock discussion that was to have been held at Cambridge. There appears to have been a peculiar reluctance on the part of the commissioners to condemn Philpot; and Bonner said petulantly, 'I marvel that men will trouble me with these matters; but *I must be obedient to my betters*, and I wis men speak otherwise of me than I deserve.' At the very commencement of the persecution Gardiner had given a similar hint. When Rogers said at his trial, 'The Queen would have done well enough but for his [Gardiner's] counsel,' Gardiner replied that 'the Queen went before them in their counsels, which proceeded of her own proper motion.'

It has been said that the State rather than the Church is responsible for this odious persecution; and this is so far true, that the House of Commons, in which no clergy sat, took the initiative in re-enacting the iniquitous law under which all the burnings took place, and that the dignitaries of the Church, not altogether excluding even Bonner, entered into the work without zest, and had to be pushed on by a power from behind. But it is not quite fair to call that power 'the State,' for the State officers, as well as the Church officers, shrank from imbruing their hands with innocent blood. The Queen had to issue strong orders to the justices of the peace to search out heretics and bring them to their ordinaries. Complaints were brought before the Council that the sheriffs were reluctant to carry out the sentences, and they had to be admonished for their slackness. In fact, the period was, as it has been justly termed, 'the most un-English period of English history;'[1] and Englishmen, of whatever

[1] Aubrey Moore, 'History of the Reformation.'

class or creed, naturally revolted against the cruelty of which they were forced to be the administrators.

It is needless to harrow the reader's feelings by describing in detail the tortures which were endured in most cases with heroic fortitude. The majority of the sufferers were of the lower and middle classes,[1] and the area of the sufferings was, with some exceptions, confined to the Southern and Eastern counties. Next to London, Canterbury[2] seems to have witnessed the most burnings; and next to Canterbury, the diocese of Norwich, under Bishop John Hopton.[3] The total number of victims has been variously estimated, but the lowest estimate is nearly 300. Among them were no less than five bishops. The fate of Bishop Hooper has been already told. The next episcopal victim was Robert Ferrar, Bishop of S. David's, whose fortune was peculiarly hard, for he suffered from both sides. He was actually in prison at the time of King Edward's death for an offence against the Statute of *Præmunire*. But he had professed and done quite enough to bring him within the range of the more terrible statute *De Hæretico Comburendo*, and on March 30, 1555, he was burnt at Carmarthen, the principal town in his diocese. Like almost all the victims, he met death with fortitude, venturing even to stake his faith upon his courage. 'If,' he said to a bystander, 'you see me stir in the fire, believe not the doctrine I have taught;' and he never stirred.

[1] About 250 are said to have belonged to the class of artificers and husbandmen, including 55 women.

[2] Harpsfield, Archdeacon of Canterbury, was Pole's Commissary-General, and a bitter persecutor.

[3] London 128, Canterbury 55, Norwich 46.

But the three most illustrious of all the victims of the persecution were the three prelates, Cranmer, Ridley and Latimer. Of all the names connected with the earlier phase of the Reformation in England, none stand out so prominently as theirs. They were men of very different types of character. Cranmer was an amiable, timid, moderate man, with a fair share of learning, who in ordinary times would probably have passed through life with decent credit, if not with distinction. He would have made a good head of a college, or Dean in a provincial cathedral city.[1] It was by a kind of accident that he was

[1] The next but one of Cranmer's successors at Canterbury (Parker) takes a far higher and less qualified estimate of his predecessor's merits, both moral and intellectual: 'Concilia omnia et antiquitatem ad ipsa Apostolorum tempora investigavit; theologiam totam, detracta illa quam sophistæ obduxerant vitiata certe, ad vivum resecavit; quam tamen non doctrina magis quam moribus et vita expressit. Mira enim temperantia, mira animi lenitate atque placabilitate fuit ut nulla injuria aut contumelia ad viam aut vindictam provocare possit; inimicissimosque, quorum vim et potentiam etsi despexit ac leviter tulit, ab offensione tamen ad inimicitias deponendas atque gratiam ineundam sæpe humanitate duxit. Eam præterea constantiam, gravitatem ac moderationem præ se tulit, ut in omni varietate rebusque, sive secundis, sive adversis, nunquam turbari animum ex fronte vultuque colligeres' (Matt. Parker, 'De Antiq. Britann. Eccles.,' p. 495). If a calm and reasonable man like Parker could write thus, it may be imagined into what extravagances partisans, who were not so careful to measure their words, would run. Such extravagance of course led to a reaction; and men who had no sympathy with Rome were led, by the spirit of revolt against undue praise, unduly to vilify Cranmer. The most notable instance is Lord Macaulay. Cranmer's conduct 'excites in him a loathing to which it is difficult to find a vent without calling foul names' 'When an attempt is made to set him [Cranmer] up as a saint, it is scarcely possible for any man of sense, who knows the history of the times, to preserve

plunged into the vortex of Church politics at the most critical of all periods in the history of the National Church. Such a man in such a position was sure to give occasion for an unfavourable representation of his character. He seems to have had that dangerous faculty of really persuading his conscience that he was right, when to the unbiased judgment of outsiders he appeared obviously wrong. But his very faults—his pliability, his timidity, his inconsistency—were among the reasons why the Church was able to tide over a most perilous crisis. Ridley and Latimer were the very antipodes of Cranmer. Ridley always knew what he meant, and had the moral courage to say it, and to act upon it, but he would have been a most dangerous man in Cranmer's position; the National Church would probably have become a sect, like the many which arose and flourished on the Continent. Latimer was simply the popular preacher whose honest, outspoken utterances, seasoned with a spice of rather coarse wit, just suited the palate of Henry VIII., over whom he had great influence. His sermons, as they have come down to us, are, it must be owned, not unjustly characterized by Archdeacon Perry as 'rodomontades,' but we must remember that we

his gravity.' 'The apology made for him by his admirers only renders his conduct more contemptible' ('Essays': Review of Hallam's 'Constitutional History'). 'Saintly in his profession, unscrupulous in his dealings, zealous for nothing, bold in speculation, a coward and a time-server in action,' etc. ('History of England,' ch. i.). For a correction of these wild and frantic utterances see Canon Dixon's admirable and well-balanced summing-up of Cranmer's merits and demerits ('History of the Church of England, from the Abolition of the Roman Jurisdiction,' vol. iv., pp. 549-552).

only have them as taken down by his hearers; and as 'Honest Latimer' was one who thoroughly lived up to what he preached, we can understand his being a distinct power both in Church and State.

These three notable men were all confined for a year and a half at Oxford, whither they had been sent to represent the new learning at the sham conference noticed above. On October 16, 1555, Ridley and Latimer, after a long trial before the legatine commission, were burnt 'at the ditch over against Balliol College,' Latimer uttering at the stake the memorable prophecy, 'Be of good comfort, Master Ridley; we shall this day light such a candle, by God's grace, in England, as I trust shall never be put out.' Cranmer was still kept in prison, because he had been appointed a Metropolitan by the Pope's Bulls before the 'schism' commenced, and had therefore to be excommunicated by the Pope before he could be dealt with. This delay was of very questionable advantage to him, for after the death of his two friends, and while he was awaiting his own sentence, the Spanish priests approached him with true Spanish craft. It is impossible to believe that there was ever any real intention of pardoning him. Why should there have been? He was at least as deeply committed as either Ridley or Latimer, and was more offensive to the Queen personally. His conversion, even if it had been sincere at the time, could never have been trusted. There can be little doubt that the policy pursued towards him was to trade upon his timidity, to lure him on by vague, false hopes, to make him sink lower and lower, both in his own esteem and also, when it was disclosed, in the esteem of his fellow-country-

men, and to burn him at last. Cranmer fell into the trap. No less than six separate recantations were extorted from him, each claiming more and more; but the plan failed, after all. It seems to me a gratuitous assumption that he made in S. Mary's Church his famous recantation of all his former recantations, simply because he found that, after all, it would be useless to hope to save his life by concealing his real sentiments. There is, so far as I am aware, no evidence to show that the hopes, such as they were, that were held out to him were ever withdrawn. It is more in accordance with facts, as it is more charitable, to believe that he really *did*, as he plainly implies that he did, pluck up heart of grace, follow at last the example of his two friends, and startle his enemies by declaring that, come what might, he would tell the truth. On March 21, 1556, he was burnt on the same spot on which Ridley and Latimer had been burnt, and showed at the stake the same fortitude that they had shown.

The death of the Queen in November, 1558, followed within sixteen hours by that of the Cardinal Archbishop Pole, put, of course, an immediate stop to the persecutions. Personally Pole was a humane man, but as representative of Rome he must share with Mary the odium of all the proceedings.[1]

By a grim kind of irony, the results of the Marian persecution were the exact opposite of what was intended. It did what all the reformers put together had failed to do. Before the reign of Mary it is doubtful whether the mass of Englishmen had really

[1] 'We must never forget that by one word uttered by him [Pole] all the fires of Smithfield would have ceased to burn.'—Hook's 'Pole,' p. 385.

gone heart and soul into the Reformation movement; it had not been at all chimerical to expect that they might return to the Roman obedience. But henceforth this was absolutely out of the question. Detestation of Rome was only equalled by detestation of Spain.

Again, the persecution tended immensely to strengthen that phase of reform to which it was most of all opposed, and which would otherwise have never gained the hold it did in England. It was the Marian persecution which drove Englishmen abroad, where they learnt Puritanism. The principles on which the worship of God was conducted at Frankfort, Zurich, and Strasburg, the chief resorts of the exiles, were not the principles upon which the English Church rests. If they had been, she would not have been what she is, the continuous representative of the old historic Church of Augustine and Theodore.

In conclusion, it must not be forgotten that the same perverted sense of duty which led Mary to originate and encourage cruelties, such as have never been perpetrated to the same extent in England before or since, also led her to acts of unselfish devotion which distinguished her honourably both from her father and her sister. She had a far more real sense of religion than either. She was a church-restorer, while they were church-robbers. The pity of it was that, while sincerely striving to do right, she was led so fatally to do wrong; and no apology that I have ever seen has in the least degree taken away the indelible blot upon the Church of Rome, which might at any moment have stopped the cruelties which it seems to have directly encouraged.

CHAPTER XV.

THE TUDOR PERIOD.

The Church in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth (1558-1603).

Elizabeth's Church policy — Her complex character — Her chequered experience in youth—Her choice of wise counsellors—Sir William Cecil—Sir Nicholas Bacon—Matthew Parker—His qualifications for the Primacy—His consecration at Lambeth—First Parliament—Act of Supremacy—Act of Uniformity—Abortive conference at Westminster—Court of High Commission—Bishops deprived—The Elizabethan Prayer-Book—Appointment of new bishops—Difficulty in filling up vacancies—Impoverishment of the Church—Licensed lay-readers—Second Book of Homilies—The Thirty-nine Articles—Events of 1569 change the attitude of Roman Catholics—Bull *Regnans in Excelsis*—Greater severity against Roman Catholics—Seminary priests and 'English Mission'—William Allen, Edmund Campion, Robert Parsons—Treasonable designs—Spanish Armada—Execution of priests and fines for recusancy—Roman Catholics treated as traitors—Jewell's *Apology*—Puritans treated as heretics—Foreign interference—The Vestiarian Controversy—'Advertisements' of 1566—Thirty-seven London clergy suspended—Universities license Puritan preachers—Puritanism at Cambridge—Thomas Cartwright—Object of Puritans—London under Bishops Grindal and Sandys—'Prophesyings' suppressed—Grindal as Primate—Whitgift as Primate, all-powerful—Aylmer, Bishop of London—Whitgift's 'Articles of Discipline'—Oath *ex officio*—'Marprelate Libels'—Hooker and Travers at the Temple Church—Hooker's *Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*—Bancroft's sermon at Paul's Cross—Thomas Bilson—The Lambeth Articles—General character of the Elizabethan Church.

So on November 17, 1558, Queen Mary died broken-hearted, and those who shrank from a return to the Roman yoke breathed again.[1] But if they thought that the change from one sister to another meant the swinging back of the ecclesiastical pendulum from the extreme in one direction, which it had reached under Mary, to the extreme in another, which it had reached under Edward, they soon found themselves wofully mistaken. The ecclesiastical policy of the great Queen was to produce, not a violent swinging of the pendulum one way or the other, but equilibrium; and, consciously or unconsciously, she was the saviour of the Church of England from making shipwreck on the perilous rocks which lay on either side of her.

In ecclesiastical as in civil affairs, for the next forty-five years by far the most prominent figure on the stage is the Queen herself; and the period before us can never be rightly understood without a clear perception of the character of Queen Elizabeth, who not only reigned, but ruled, and to whom there had been no equal, as a monarch, since Edward I.

There were some points in her character which were singularly unpromising with regard to her becoming a true nursing-mother to the Church. She was not a *high*-minded, much less a *spiritually*-minded, woman; she was strikingly deficient in enthusiasm, in the good sense of that term; in fact, the religious instinct seemed to be wanting in her. Her duplicity and shiftiness; her intense personal vanity, which increased rather than diminished with years; her vacillation; her lack

[1] November 17 was for many years observed as a day of thanksgiving for the accession of Queen Elizabeth.

of interest in the higher questions of theology, and in theologians *as* theologians; her insularity, which prevented her mind as well as her body from ever travelling beyond a very limited range; her womanly weakness, which seemed to bring her constantly to the very verge of making a *faux pas;* her love of money, which made her as glaring a robber of church property as her father himself had been: these were defects which appear strangely inconsistent with the rôle of a great religious leader.

On the other hand, her vigorous and masculine intellect; her iron will and tenacity of purpose when she had once made up her mind, which she was slow in doing; her thoroughly English temper, that instinct which always guided her aright in judging what Englishmen *would* bear, and what they would *not;* the mingled feeling of love and fear which she had the faculty of inspiring; the art of knowing exactly how far to yield to the opinions of her counsellors (whom she generally chose with great judgment), without compromising her dignity, must be set against her defects.

When she ascended the throne, at the age of twenty-five, she had had such an experience as few had gone through who were double her age. From her earliest childhood she had been obliged to exercise the severest self-control; she had passed through the most critical occasions with the most consummate prudence; she had watched with her shrewd eye the dangers which had beset her father, her brother, and her sister in their reigns, knowing all the while that she would probably stand in the place in which they stood. She had never had a mother's care; but she had had a stepmother who had been more than a mother to

her in the wise, accomplished, and cultured Queen Catherine; and a tutor in Roger Ascham who had cultivated her naturally good talents and made her a highly educated woman.[1] The result will be illustrated in detail, and it will be found that, if the Elizabethan era is a great[2] era in Church no less than in State, the greatest figure in it is Elizabeth herself.

It will be said, no doubt, that she was fortunate in her counsellors. So she was; but to her belongs the credit both of choosing them and also of retaining their confidence. The three men by whom she was chiefly guided in Church affairs, with which alone we are concerned, in the early part of her reign, were William Cecil, Nicholas Bacon, and Matthew Parker. They were all at Cambridge together, where they were drawn to one another by a common desire for University reform; and they retained the intimacy they had then formed throughout life.

With her usual sagacity, Elizabeth at once selected *William Cecil* (1520-1598), created Baron of Burghley in 1571, as her chief Secretary of State. Cecil had already attained a high position in the political world, but he had stood aloof from politics in Queen Mary's

[1] One naturally regards with some suspicion the glowing accounts of the proficiency of royal pupils; but the accounts of the proficiency of the Princess Elizabeth by so good a man as Roger Ascham are too detailed to be disregarded. He tells us that she talked French and Italian as well as English; that she could hold her own well in Latin conversation, and in Greek fairly; that she was a good critic of style in Latin, Greek and English; that she delighted in music, etc. Ascham read Greek and played chess with her until his death in 1568.

[2] 'Great' in one sense, but in another, and a higher, very far from great. See *infra*, pp. 483, 484.

reign, disapproving her policy, and especially her cruelty towards those who differed from her in religion. In spite of cross-currents, which at times diverted the wayward woman into other courses, Elizabeth in the main followed the path which her wise counsellor marked out for her. It is often difficult to ascertain whether the Church policy of this reign really originated with the Queen or with her Minister. The explanation probably is that it was all the same thing, for, in the striking language of Mr. Froude, Elizabeth 'was a woman and a man; she was herself and Cecil'; and the base assassins in will, who strove to compass their ends by foul means, showed a true knowledge of the situation when they aimed at the death both of Sir William Cecil and the Queen. Of the two parties which strove to draw England either into the Roman extreme on the one side, or into the Puritan extreme on the other, Cecil certainly feared and disliked the former most; nor can he be acquitted of cruelty in his dealings with it; but he walked himself, and kept his royal mistress, in the *via media*, which was the true path of the Church of England.

The fame of Sir *Nicholas Bacon* (1509-1579) has been somewhat eclipsed by that of his still more illustrious son, Francis; but he was a wise and trusted counsellor of the great Queen, who, it is said, was content for many years to leave 'the ordering of Church matters for the most part' in the hands of Bacon and Cecil. Like Cecil, Bacon was, on the accession of Elizabeth, at once promoted to a post of high dignity and responsibility, being appointed on December 22, 1558, Lord Keeper of the Great Seal, in the place of Archbishop Heath. He

was, perhaps, a little more inclined to the Puritan party than even Cecil was, but in the reign of Queen Mary he had been allowed to retain his office in the Court of Wards on condition that he should not leave England. He had therefore not been, like those who had fled or been banished from England, influenced by foreign reformers; and he maintained, on the whole, a consistent attitude as an English Churchman.

Matthew Parker (1504-1575), the third member of the triumvirate, was in one sense the most important of the three, so far as Church matters were concerned; for though, as Dr. Hallam observes, Cecil and Bacon may have been 'incomparably superior in talent to all the other early councillors'[1] of the Queen, they were laymen; and Elizabeth, in spite of her cavalier treatment of many individual bishops and clergy, still desired to have Church affairs managed chiefly by accredited and ordained Church officers. Whether it was the Queen herself, or his friends, Bacon and Cecil, who procured the appointment of Parker to the Primacy, vacant by the death of Cardinal Pole, the choice showed a rare discrimination, which seemed hardly to be justified by Parker's antecedents. It is highly probable that the Queen herself was predisposed in his favour from the fact that he had been chaplain to her mother, and had always maintained Anne's innocence. Bacon and Cecil regarded him with that generous confidence with which junior members of a University are wont to regard a trusted senior; and one of the first ecclesiastical proceedings in the new reign was on a subject in which Parker was peculiarly qualified to shine. This was the

[1] 'Const. Hist.,' vol. i., ch. iii., p. 110.

arrangement of an English liturgy, in which Parker's antiquarian researches rendered him a valuable counsellor.[1] He was summoned to London, but was prevented by illness from taking part in the preparation of the English Prayer-Book, about which more will be said presently. Parker was now afraid that some higher post would be offered to him. He was more than content with his present position as Dean of Lincoln; he had thoroughly enjoyed the learned leisure which enforced obscurity during the reign of Queen Mary had afforded him, and he really seemed more fitted for a sedentary than for an active life; for he was a nervous man, without the gift of eloquence—a man of good common-sense, but not of brilliant talents—a well-read man, but not a profound theologian; not of strong health, not of aristocratic connections. But his friends discovered that he possessed qualifications such as no other man possessed for the delicate and dangerous task to which he was called. He had studied the Fathers and the early Church, and he knew that neither Rome nor Geneva could bear to be judged by that test, and that England could; he thoroughly realized the true position of the Church of England, and was determined to maintain it.[2] At the same time he was a practical and reasonable man, who would not be likely to drive the extreme men on either side into hopeless Nonconformity. His character was unim-

[1] 'His great skill in antiquity reached to ecclesiastical as well as historical matters.'—Strype, 'Correspondence,' p. 111.

[2] The one object at which he aimed was, to use his own words, 'that that most holy and godly form of discipline which was commonly used in the primitive Church might be called home again.'

peachable; he had remained in quiet obscurity in England during the Marian persecution, and so had imbibed none of the foreign ideas which the returned exiles brought back with them. Above all, he was a man well adapted for managing and pleasing the Queen herself. It was no mock modesty which led him to refuse the archbishopric of Canterbury when it was offered to him through his friend Bacon. His refusal was taken so seriously that the post was actually offered to another, Dr. Wotton, Dean of Canterbury, a favourer of the Roman party, who, however, wisely declined it, feeling himself not strong enough for the office. There was even some talk of its being offered to Feckenham, who had been Abbot of the lately-restored abbey of Westminster, the most lovable and best-beloved of all the Roman party; but this was mere talk. The choice was exceedingly limited; the existing bishops, who were reduced to sixteen, refused, with one exception (Kitchen, of Llandaff), to take the oath of supremacy, and were not available. In spite of the offer to Dean Wotton, the old clergy of Mary's time must, as a body, have been regarded as out of the question. The Queen herself would have strongly objected to the appointment of any clergyman Puritanically inclined. There was no alternative but to appoint Parker; and so he received a peremptory summons from the Queen, through his friend Bacon, which he was bound to obey; and after some delay he was consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury at Lambeth, December 17, 1569. William Barlow, late Bishop of Bath and Wells, Bishop-elect of Chichester, was chosen by Parker himself to preside at the consecration. John Hodgkins, suffragan Bishop of Bedford, Miles Cover-

dale, late Bishop of Exeter, and John Scory, late Bishop of Chichester, Bishop-elect of Hereford, were the other consecrators, and the consecration sermon was preached by Scory.[1]

It seemed necessary to dwell upon these details, because an absurd story was invented nearly fifty years later, casting ridicule upon the consecration, and affirming that it took place amid ludicrous circumstances at the Nag's Head Tavern in Cheapside. Doubts were also thrown upon the validity of William Barlow's, the chief consecrator's, own consecration, of which there is no record in Cranmer's registers. But both these objections have now been abandoned by the best-educated and most reasonable among the Roman Catholics themselves.[2] Archbishop Parker's consecration was as valid and as decorously conducted as that of any

[1] Mr. Aubrey Moore ('History of the Reformation') places Kitchen, Bishop of Llandaff, first among the consecrators; but is it not true that, though the name of Kitchen certainly appears first in the commission, he refused to act?

[2] Thus Dr. Lingard, the very able Roman Catholic historian of England, writes: 'When we find Barlow during ten years, the remainder of Henry's reign, constantly associated with the other consecrated bishops, discharging with them all the duties both spiritual and secular, of a consecrated bishop, summoned equally with them to Parliament and Convocation, taking his seat among them according to seniority, it seems most unreasonable to suppose, without direct proof, that he had never received that sacred rite, without which, according to the laws of both Church and State, he could not have become a member of the episcopal body.'

The whole question of Parker's consecration is exhaustively treated by the Bishop of Stepney (Dr. Forest Browne) in his lectures to men, delivered at S. Columba's, Kingsland Road, in which will be found the new evidence, only discovered in 1895 which quite settles the question.

Archbishop who has ever sat on the seat of Augustine; and for sixteen years he executed his difficult task, under the most trying circumstances in which a Primate was ever placed, with unexpected ability and conspicuous success.

With three such counsellors, Elizabeth was not likely to embark upon any rash course of Church policy. Indeed, she showed of herself that she did not intend to do so. On November 23, 1558, she set forth on her progress from Hatfield to London, and two significant incidents occurred on the way. The sixteen bishops met her, and were all allowed to kiss her hand with the exception of Bonner, from whom she turned away as if the stain of blood were upon him. On her entry into London she found a pageant awaiting her; and as she was passing through a triumphal arch a Bible was let down, which the Queen, somewhat theatrically, pressed to her breast, declaring that she would always read that book. Thus she showed that she was not at any rate going to follow in the steps of her sister Mary. On the other hand, she indicated quite as plainly that she was not going to sanction any hasty or violent changes before she had duly consulted the representatives of Church and State in Convocation and Parliament. Everything was to remain *in statu quo* until these assemblies met. The Mass was still celebrated in the churches; the Marian prelates might still have retained their sees, if they could submit to the new order. But they had, of course, to take the oath of allegiance to the new Sovereign; and in that oath she was designated, as her father had been, 'the Head of the Church.' Heath, Archbishop of York, who in the vacancy of the see of

Canterbury was the head of the hierarchy, protested; the other bishops followed his example, and refused to take part in the coronation, which was fixed for January 15. Perhaps, also, they objected to the royal proclamation which commanded the English Litany to be used in the London churches, the Epistle and Gospel being also read in English by order of the Lord Mayor—a strange authority! At last one of the bishops, Dr. Owen Oglethorpe, of Carlisle, consented to crown the Queen; and other bishops appear, after all, to have been present at the ceremony.

On January 25 Parliament was opened by the Queen in person; and on this occasion she again showed that she meant to leave the future an open question. The Mass was celebrated at Westminster as it had been when Mary was crowned, but the Host was not elevated, and the sermon was preached by Dr. Cox, one of the Marian exiles. A series of important Acts affecting the interests of the Church were passed in this Parliament. First came the Act of Supremacy, or, as she was careful to call it, 'the Act restoring the ancient jurisdiction to the Crown over the estate ecclesiastical and spiritual;'[1] but the Queen desired to be termed, not the 'Supreme Head,' but the 'Supreme Governor of the Church.' This was not a distinction without a difference, for the term 'head,' as applied to the Church, is used theologically, not in its secondary sense as equivalent to ruler, but in its proper sense as part of the body; and in this sense there is only One to whom it can

[1] 'Rex,' writes Bracton, the famous lawyer in the thirteenth century, 'est Vicarius et Minister Dei, tam in Spiritualibus quam temporalibus' (lib. i., cap. 8).

be applied without irreverence. It may be also, as Mr. Wakeman says, that 'by her repudiation of the title of Supreme Head she was careful to dissociate herself from the evil traditions of the dictatorships of Cromwell and Northumberland.'[1] Then followed the Act of Uniformity for restoring the use of the English Prayer-Book, which, if strictly enforced, would be fatal to the irreconcilables among the Marian bishops and clergy. The Bill was opposed in the House of Lords by all the bishops, and by nine temporal peers; but it passed. Some measures were ominously suggestive of a return to that system of church robbery which had been a disgrace to the reigns of the Queen's father and brother. The first-fruits of benefices, which had very properly been restored by Queen Mary to the Church, were to be given back to the Crown, to which they had never rightly belonged; the temporalities of vacant sees were also to be given to the Crown during a vacancy —an arrangement offering a sore temptation to the Queen, to which she frequently yielded, of prolonging vacancies to an exorbitant extent. The property Queen Mary had surrendered to the religious orders which she had made an attempt to revive was again allowed to lapse to the Crown, and the Queen was empowered by an Act of Parliament to take, on the vacancy of any bishopric, any of its lands she chose in exchange for impropriate tithes which had come to the Crown with monastic property; that is, as Dean Milman expresses it, 'to exchange these tithes, a possession of uncertain value, of difficult and expensive collection, for the broad lands of the bishops'[2]—

[1] 'The Church and the Puritans,' p. 4.

[2] 'Annals of S. Paul's Cathedral,' ch. xi., p. 271.

a manifest advantage to the Queen, and disadvantage to the Church. In the regulation of Divine service there was a strange amalgamation of the old and the new: all preaching was forbidden for the present; the Creed, the Ten Commandments, and the Epistle and Gospel, were to be read in English, beginning on January 1, 1658-9; but the Mass was still to be celebrated as it was in Queen Mary's days. Such rules were obviously temporary, but how was a permanent settlement to be arrived at? The Queen had determined to do nothing without consulting the Temporalty and the Spiritualty. But the two powers were hopelessly at variance. Two attempts were made, one of which may be described as an attempt to cut, the other to untie, the Gordian knot.

1. In March, 1559, a conference met at Westminster for a discussion of the points at issue between selected champions of the contending parties. The preliminary arrangements seem to have been made with the utmost fairness to both sides. Archbishop Heath, a mild and reasonable man, was to select the champions on the Roman side; Bishop Scory, those on the Anglican. The Lord Keeper Bacon was to preside, but was to be balanced by the Archbishop as his assessor. Under any circumstances the conference would probably have ended, as such conferences generally do end, in leaving matters just as they were, or perhaps in confirming both parties more strongly than ever in their own opinions. But it must be confessed that the Roman party put themselves gratuitously in the wrong before the discussion began; for though the chiefs of it had distinctly accepted the terms of the discussion, yet

when they were asked to state their case, they refused to begin, on the ground that they could not admit the validity of any discussion conducted under the presidency of a layman. This surely ought to have been thought of before. There was some justification for the Lord Keeper's angry and ominous reply, 'As you will not let us hear you, you shall hear from us shortly'—which they did. But the only direct result of the abortive Westminster Conference was that it provoked two of the most uncompromising of the bishops—Dr. White, Bishop of Winchester, and Dr. Watson, of Lincoln—to use some hasty expressions, for which they were committed to the Tower.

2. The other attempt was of a much more real and permanent nature, and was, indeed, fraught with momentous consequences. As Convocation was irreconcilable, Elizabeth was determined to establish a *Court of High Commission*. The Act of Supremacy empowered the Queen to exercise the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the Crown by commissioners appointed under the Great Seal; and this power she now proceeded to exercise. Perhaps under the circumstances it was necessary; but the High Commission Court proved subsequently a source of great embarrassment.

The way was prepared for the establishment of the commission by the issuing in the spring of 1559 of Royal Injunctions, which corresponded, with a few characteristic additions,[1] to those issued at the

[1] The two chief additions were some stringent regulations about the marriage of the clergy, a subject on which the Queen had very strong opinions, and a very clear and outspoken declaration about the nature of the royal supremacy, affirming

commencement of Edward VI.'s reign, and also of certain Articles of Inquiry framed upon the Injunctions. Thus in June of the same year the Court of High Commission was established, and a general visitation with regard to ecclesiastical matters took place throughout the whole kingdom.

One of the first duties of the commission was an unpleasant one. It was, of course, necessary that the surviving bishops should take the oath of supremacy. With the exception of Bishop Kitchen, of Llandaff, they all refused to do so, and were deprived by the Court of High Commission. If it be true that Elizabeth, on her accession, notified the fact to the Pope, Paul IV., and that he replied that the kingdom of England was held in fee of the Apostolic See, and that she could not succeed, being illegitimate, of course they had no alternative, for they all accepted the Pope as the head of Western Christendom. But the story, though repeated without a doubt by popular historians, has been disputed —indeed, we may say disproved.[1] At any rate, the bishops were deprived, but it cannot be said that, as a rule, they were harshly treated. Time was given them to reconsider their decision ; and when they still refused to take the oath, they were quartered upon other bishops and conforming clergy, by whom they

---

that 'the Queen neither does nor will challenge any other authority than that which was used by her father and brother, viz., the sovereignty over all persons born within the realm, and the exclusion of all foreign jurisdiction.' See Bishop Vowler Short's 'Sketch of the History of the Church of England,' ch. viii., § 406 ; and Archdeacon Perry's 'Reformation in England' (Epochs of Church History Series), ch. xvii.

[1] See Hallam's 'Const. Hist.,' vol. i., ch. iii., p. 109, note *b* ; and Dr. Lingard's 'History of England,' vol. vi., ch. i.

were generally treated with courtesy and kindness.

The next work of the commission was to appoint a sub-committee of select divines to prepare measures of ecclesiastical reform to be submitted to Parliament, and especially to put forth a liturgy suitable for the remodelled Church of England. Sir Thomas Smith was chairman of the commission, and the commissioners met at his house in Cannon Row, Westminster. In this commission several of the Marian exiles were included, viz., Grindal, Sandys, Whitehead, Pilkington, and Cox. The last-named had always maintained his Church principles most consistently, and he and Matthew Parker were unquestionably the most influential members. William May also, Dean of S. Paul's, who had taken part in the drawing up of the First Prayer-Book of Edward VI., 1548-49, and who, in spite of his prominence in the early days of the Reformation, was allowed to remain in England all through the reign of Mary unmolested, would probably act with Parker and Cox; and so, too, would Dr. Bill, Dean of Westminster, who, though a strong reformer, had remained in retirement in England during Mary's reign. Parker, however, was often absent through indisposition, and the leading part was taken by Dr. Guest, afterwards Bishop of Rochester. It was Dr. Guest who himself took the new service-book to Cecil when it was completed.

The Queen herself was characteristically in favour of simply adopting the First Prayer-Book of Edward VI.; so was Cecil; so also was Parker personally; but the Puritan element in the commission, and the known Protestantism of Parlia-

ment, led the cautious Parker to see that this would not be feasible ; so he persuaded Elizabeth with some difficulty to allow the Prayer-Book of 1552 to be the basis on which to proceed. The Church party, however (as Parker and his friends may fairly be called), virtually carried their point. The assertion of the Real Presence was restored in the words of administration in the Holy Communion ; the vestments were brought back by the Ornaments Rubric ; the very offensive petition in the Litany—'From the tyranny of the Bishop of Rome and all his detestable enormities, good Lord, deliver us'—was expunged.

The book was sent by the commission to Parliament to be embodied in the Act of Uniformity, it being hopeless to expect to pass it through a Convocation of which Bonner was still President in the Upper House, and Harpsfield Prolocutor in the Lower. The book was first used on June 24, 1559.

What course the Queen herself intended to pursue was an enigma. On the one hand, the hearts of the reformers were gladdened by the tidings that the English service had been adopted in her royal chapel as early as May 12, 1559—that is, four days before the day appointed by Act of Parliament for its general use. Then, again, on September 5, when the obsequies of King Henry II. of France were celebrated with great ceremony at S. Paul's, three out of the four bishops-elect,[1] including the Primate himself, appeared in black gowns, which was a comforting sight. Moreover, though Elizabeth retained the Mass, she forbade the elevation of the Host ; and though she distinctly refused to sanction the abrogation of her sister's laws about the celibacy of the

[1] The fourth, Grindal, was absent from indisposition.

clergy, yet this might be explained by her strong objection to matrimony generally, and need not be accounted as Popish. But when, on All Saints' Day, lighted tapers in broad daylight and a silver crucifix on the altar were seen in the Chapel Royal, the reformers' hearts sank within them.

But Elizabeth was equally determined to resist the pressure put upon her by what was afterwards called the Puritan party and by the Roman Catholics. She had been deeply offended by the reflections obliquely cast upon her government by John Knox in his 'First Blast of the Trumpet against the Monstrous Regiment of Women,' published in the very year of her accession, and she forbade the reformer to enter her kingdom.[1] She took no notice of a rather impertinent letter which the German reformers, Bullinger and Peter Martyr, wrote to her at the time when the new liturgy was being prepared, urging her to 'root out the last seeds of Popery from her dominions.' So far from placing herself at first at the head of 'the Protestant interest,' she indignantly refused to send a representative to the Council of Trent, not because she objected to the council, but because England was summoned as a Protestant, not as a Catholic, country. She was equally proof against advances from the other side. When Pope Pius IV. wrote, actually offering to approve her new Prayer-Book, and to allow the reception of the Elements in both kinds, on condition that she would allow the Roman claims, and receive the Prayer-Book on his authority, not only would she not entertain his

[1] John Knox also uttered the most violent tirades against the English Book of Common Prayer, which would not tend to conciliate the Queen towards him.

proposals for a moment, but she would not even admit his Nuncio into England.[1] In short, she meant to rule as an island Queen in an island Church.

Her difficulty was to have that Church manned with officers to her taste. The old bishops were deprived, and the new ones to supply their places had perforce to be chosen from among those returned exiles whose 'Germanic natures,' as Parker termed them, she disliked as much as Parker himself could do. However, the best was done that could be done under the circumstances, and she was in no particular hurry about filling up the vacancies, for the revenues of the vacant sees fell meanwhile to the Crown. Parker himself was a man after her own heart. William May, Dean of S. Paul's, was designated Archbishop of York, but died before his consecration. He was succeeded at S. Paul's by Alexander Nowell, a man of learning and piety, and writer of the well-known Catechisms which bear his name. Dr. Cox was appointed Bishop of Ely; he had been one of the Marian exiles, but had taken so decided a part in favour of the use of the Church liturgy at Frankfort, against John Knox, that his followers were called 'Coxians,' as opposed to the 'Knoxians,' who opposed the use of the liturgy. Edmund Grindal

[1] It is only fair to add that a contemporary writer, 'J. H.' [J. Howlett], in a scarce work published at Douay some years afterwards, distinctly denies the fact of this overture of the Pope: 'That which hath been given out (as is said by some great men), that this Pope, by his letter to her Majesty, did offer to confirm the service of England, upon condition that the title of supremacy might be restored him again, is impossible to be so. So that if any such letters came to her Majesty's hands they must needs be fayned and false.'

was appointed to the see of London, Sandys to Worcester, and Horne to Winchester—all favourable to what was afterwards called Puritanism.

The difficulty of manning the lower ranks of the clergy seemed likely to be even greater. If the existing clergy should follow the example of their leaders, and refuse to take the oath, what was to be done? Happily, this was not the case. Out of more than 9,000, only 189, the majority of whom were dignitaries, refused to take the oath of supremacy and to accept the new Prayer-Book. But the ranks of the clergy were thinned by another cause: a great number of them had been swept away by a terrible pestilence, and it was extremely difficult to fill their places; for in the uncertainty and confusion of the last thirty years theological learning at the Universities had fallen to a low ebb, and there was really not a sufficient number of decently competent divines to be had. Nor was there any inducement in the way of worldly advantage to stimulate men to prepare themselves for the holy office. The Church had been pillaged on all sides. First, the dissolution of the monasteries had cruelly impoverished the parish churches in the following way: The monasteries had always been eager to procure the impropriation of tithes; hence very many parish churches had been served by monks, a stipend being paid to them as vicars; and a small stipend sufficed, as the monk had his monastery to fall back upon. At the dissolution the impropriated tithes had not been restored to the Church, but had fallen into the hands of laymen, who were not willing to pay a larger stipend than the monastery had paid to the monk-vicar. Hence the value of many vicarages was

below starvation-point. Then the Church had had to satisfy the cravings of greedy courtiers when the reformers were uppermost, and in the brief interval of Roman supremacy the bishops and clergy regarded the appropriation of Church property as a kind of spoiling of the Egyptians; that property would soon, as they knew, fall into the hands of the heretics, so they had better make the most of their brief opportunity, and, in plain words, take all they could get. The Church, in short, having been inordinately rich, was now miserably poor, and as it was extremely doubtful how soon there might be another turn of the tide, which would send all her officers adrift again, it is no wonder that men shrank from seeking office in so unsettled and poverty-stricken an institution.

In the dearth of duly-ordained ministers, Parker and his coadjutors had recourse to the plan of licensing lay-readers, who might help the clergy by saying the Litany and reading the Lessons, and occasionally a homily; but they were debarred from administering the Sacraments and from preaching. Hence arose a cry that the homilies were too few, and in consequence the Second Book of Homilies, drawn up chiefly by Parker, was put forth. To Parker also is chiefly due the arrangement of the Thirty-nine Articles as they now stand. They were set forth by authority of the Convocation of both provinces, both in Latin and English, in the spring of 1562-63, and were merely a reproduction of the Forty-two Articles, with a few, but not unimportant alterations. The Church owes it to Archbishop Parker that they are *what* they are. For an attempt was made to have them extended into a long con-

fession of faith similar to that of Augsburg. If this attempt had succeeded, it would have been a step in the direction of cutting us off from the Church Catholic, whose three creeds are quite a sufficient confession of faith. As it is, the Thirty-nine Articles are not so much a confession of faith as a guide to the clergy. Parker's coadjutors in preparing the Articles were Cox, Bishop of Ely; Guest, Bishop of Rochester; and Grindal, Bishop of London.

The Church was now gradually settling itself into its present shape, and one natural result of the process was, not a healing, but a widening of the breach which separated us from the Roman party on the one hand, and from the Puritans (as they now began to be called) on the othre. It will be more convenient to treat the history of the Church during this eventful reign, not according to the dates on which each event happened, but in relation to the two all-important subjects, her dealings with the Roman and her dealings with the Puritan party. In doing so, it is fair to bear in mind that the principle of toleration was very imperfectly understood by all parties. It was virtually admitted, almost as an axiom, that everybody was bound to enforce his own views upon everybody else as a duty. Thomas Cartwright, the Puritan, was quite as clear on this point as the Pope himself. So while we deplore many acts of intolerance, not to say cruelty, which will come before us, we should in common fairness remember that the Church of Queen Elizabeth's time must not be judged by the standard of Queen Victoria's time. Bearing this caution in mind, let us consider:

1. *The Roman Controversy.*

During the first eleven years of Elizabeth's reign Roman Catholics continued to communicate, and even to minister, in the Church of England, though Mass was celebrated privately in their own houses. There had always been a distinction, though never very clearly defined, between the attitude of the 'regulars' and that of the 'seculars' towards the see of Rome, the former being more directly dependent upon it than the latter. 'Regulars' now ceased to exist in England, and many of the secular priests seemed to be imperceptibly merging into the Church of the country. But it was an anomalous state of things, not likely to last. The laws were against it on both sides. If the Pope's authority were admitted, then Elizabeth was illegitimate, and not the rightful Sovereign at all. And even if this preliminary difficulty was overcome, and she was accepted as Sovereign *de facto*, though not *de jure*, the claims which she made, and enforced with increasing severity, were such as no consistent Roman Catholic could possibly admit in theory, though he might connive at them in practice. It is true that the Act of Supremacy was so carefully explained that it might be conscientiously taken without involving the swearer in the charge of Erastianism. 'We give not,' it was said, 'to our princes the ministry of God's Word or Sacraments, but only the prerogative, which seems to have been given always to godly princes in Holy Scripture by God Himself; that is, that they should rule all States and degrees committed to their charge by God, whether they be ecclesiastical or temporal, and restrain with the

civil sword the stubborn and evil-doer.' And in Queen Elizabeth's own 'Admonition to Simple Men, deceived by the Malicious,' it is stated: 'Her Majesty neither doth, nor ever will, challenge any other authority than that which was of ancient time due to the Imperial Crown of this realm; that is, under God, to bear sovereignty and rule over all persons born within these her realms.' This might satisfy all the scruples of an *English* Churchman, but it did not touch the points which seemed, theoretically, insurmountable obstacles to the allegiance of those who were still within the Roman obedience. The Act of Supremacy expressly required not only all beneficed ecclesiastics, but also all laymen holding office under the Crown, to take an oath renouncing the spiritual as well as the temporal jurisdiction of every foreign Prince or Prelate; the Act of Uniformity forbade the use by any minister of any but the established liturgy. How could Roman Catholics abide by such laws? Many could not, and fled beyond the seas, where they swelled the ranks of those disaffected exiles who, later in the reign, became thorns in the sides of the Church and nation. The laws, instead of being relaxed, became more and more severe; for Elizabethan Parliaments were ready to go any lengths against Roman Catholics. In the year 1562 an Act was passed 'for the assurance of the Queen's power over all estates and subjects within her dominion,' which required that all who had ever taken Holy Orders, or a degree at the Universities, or been admitted to the practice of laws, should take the oath of supremacy, if tendered to them by a bishop or by commissioners under the Great Seal. This Act, it will be seen, was retrospective; and it

was indeed a sword of Damocles which might fall at any moment upon the head of any Roman Catholic. It argued the greatest forbearance on both sides that a *modus vivendi* for both should have been found to last so long as it did.

But a change was at hand, which may be dated from the year 1569. That year saw the conspiracy to marry the Duke of Norfolk to Mary Queen of Scots, and to oust Elizabeth from the throne in favour of a Roman Catholic. It also saw the great rebellion in the North under the Earls of Northumberland and Westmoreland, and the issuing of the famous Bull *Regnans in Excelsis* (published in England in 1570), in which the Queen was excommunicated by name, and her subjects absolved from their allegiance to her.[1] A copy of the Bull was nailed by a fanatic called John Felton to the gate of the Bishop of London's palace (London House), on May 15, 1570, where it might be, and was, read by crowds.

The English, as represented in Parliament, had been anti-Roman enough before; their antagonism now reached its climax. They complained of the laxity with which the present laws had been enforced, and clamoured both for stricter laws and also for greater strictness in enforcing them. So in 1571 a sweeping measure was passed by which all persons publishing any Bull from Rome, or absolving or reconciling anyone to the Church of Rome, and all persons being so reconciled, should be subject to the penalties of high treason—that is, in other words, should be punishable with death. It was also enacted

[1] Those who had taken an oath of fidelity to her were absolved from their obligation, and commanded to give her no allegiance; all who did so were subject to excommunication.

that all persons who brought into the realm 'any crosses, pictures, or superstitious things consecrated by the Pope,' should be liable to the Statute of Præmunire, and that those who should conceal or connive at offenders should be considered as guilty of misprision of treason. In the same year, 1571, which was therefore called 'the woful year of subscription,' the Thirty-nine Articles were enforced on all clergy, whether beneficed or unbeneficed.[1] These severe measures originated neither with the Queen, who declared plainly in 1570 that 'she desired to sift no man's conscience, provided that they obeyed her laws by attending church,' nor yet with the spiritualty, but with the temporalty, as represented in Parliament. The result of them was that England became intolerable for any Roman Catholic.

The Pope's Bull was speedily followed as a natural sequence by an attempt which changed the whole relationship of the Roman to the English Church. The Council of Trent had ordered the erection of seminaries for mission priests in each diocese within the Roman obedience. One of the first of these seminaries was an English college founded at Douai (afterwards removed to Rheims),[2] by William Allen, a quondam Fellow of Oriel. This was followed by

[1] The Articles were finally reviewed by Convocation in 1571, and changes and additions made, notably the famous clause in Article XX., 'The Church hath power to decree rites and ceremonies, and authority in controversies of faith,' the insertion of which was afterwards quite falsely attributed to Archbishop Laud, and made a charge against him.

[2] It was driven away from Douai for some years (1578-1593), and established at Rheims under the protection of the Guises, and with a subvention from Philip of Spain. See Dr. A. W. Ward's 'The Counter-Reformation' (Epochs of Church History), p. 123.

others at Rome, Seville, Valladolid, and S. Omer's, Philip of Spain bearing a large share of the expenses. Chiefly through the exertions of William Allen, who was made a Cardinal, an English Mission was formed, and the Pope appointed Allen to be its head. Before the mission the massacre of S. Bartholomew's Day, 1572, had exasperated and alarmed Englishmen to the highest degree; they feared, not unnaturally, that if there was a change, the same policy might be pursued in England as had been pursued in France. In the year 1574 the first seminary priests landed in England, and by 1579 as many as a hundred had established themselves in our country. In 1581 another element was introduced, on the advice of Cardinal Allen. Jesuits were summoned to take part in the English Mission. Edmund Campion, who, like Allen, was an Oxford man, having been a Fellow of St. John's, was the first to arrive; and he was quickly followed by another Oxonian, Robert Parsons, who had been a Fellow of Balliol. The object of the English Mission was not only to bring back those Roman Catholics in England, who had partially conformed to the English Church, to a sense of their duty, but actually to dethrone Elizabeth and enthrone Mary in her room; and henceforth the cry for Mary's death was loud and strong. What made the mission priests' designs the more odious was that they were to be carried out by a Spanish force, which would bring England again under the dominion of Philip, of whom it had had only too bitter an experience.[1] The

[1] Looking at the matter from a very different point of view, Mendoza writes to Philip from England, December 28, 1579: 'The number of Catholics, thank God, is daily increasing here,

Queen professed—sincerely, I believe—that she was reluctant to shed blood for the sake of religious opinions; but these were not religious opinions, they were traitorous designs.

From about the year 1580 the Roman Catholics connected with the English Mission redoubled their exertions; and in 1581 Campion, being put to the rack, revealed under the torture the names of many Roman Catholics in England. Cecil had recourse to the unworthy device of employing spies, and laws of still greater severity were passed. In 1582 it was made high treason to 'withdraw any of the Queen's Majesty's subjects from the religion by her Highness's authority established within her dominions,' or 'to move them to promise any obedience to any pretended authority of the see of Rome,' or 'to be reconciled willingly to the Romish Church.'[1] In 1585 a law was passed that 'all Jesuits, seminary and other priests, should quit the kingdom within forty days on pain of being adjudged traitors,' with other severe provisions.

owing to the college and seminary for Englishmen which your Majesty ordered to be supported in Douai, whence there has come in the last year (and from the college of Rome) a hundred Englishmen who have been ordained there, by which means a great number of people are being converted—generally persons who have never heard the truth before. These priests go about disguised as laymen, and although they are young men, their good life and zeal in the work are admirable. They exercise their duties with great good sense and discretion, in order not to give the heretics a chance to impede them,' and so forth. See Calendar of State Papers.

[1] It has been computed that 250 Roman Catholic priests were sent into England between the years 1575 and 1585, and that of these sixty were executed. See Ward's 'Counter-Reformation,' p. 124.

The Government can scarcely be blamed for putting down treason with a strong hand. That there *was* treason is certain. Not only the dethronement, but the actual assassination, of the Queen was aimed at by some. But others suffered, who only desired the exercise of their religion, and were ready to accept and to pray for Queen Elizabeth. About 200 were put to death, some for denying the Queen's supremacy, some for merely being reconciled to the Church of Rome, but the majority for exercising their ministry. At the great crisis of England's fate, when Philip sent forth his 'invincible Armada' to invade her shores, the venerable Lord Montagu, who at the beginning of Elizabeth's reign had been the first to lift up his voice against the severity with which his co-religionists, the Roman Catholics, were treated, brought a troop of horse, commanded by himself, his son, and his grandson, to meet the Queen at Tilbury and offer her their services; and it is said that at that critical time 'not one English Roman Catholic forgot the duties of patriotism in his zeal for the spread of his religion.'[1]

It would have been pleasant to be able to record that after this proof of loyalty the severity against the Roman Catholics was relaxed; but the contrary was the case. The execution of priests became more frequent after the danger had passed; and the fines for 'recusancy'—that is, for refusal to attend the parish churches—were levied at least as rigorously as ever. By an Act of 1593 recusants were forbidden

[1] Wakeman, 'The Church and the Puritans' (Epochs of Church History Series), p. 30.

to travel more than five miles from their usual place of abode under pain of forfeiture.

It is noticeable that in every case the Roman Catholics were treated as traitors, not as heretics; the offence was regarded as a political, not as a religious one; and they were handed over to the civil power for punishment, which was invariably hanging, not burning. But it does not follow from this that they were really guilty of traitorous designs. Some, no doubt, may have been, but against the vast majority not a single piece of evidence of an overt act of treason was ever alleged.

It was the temporalty, not the spiritualty, that was their most determined foe; but I cannot think that the Church was altogether free from blame. Considering the immense moral influence she possessed, she surely might have exercised that influence more effectually in mitigating the cruelties which were perpetrated. At the time, however, the complaints against her were all the other way. She was accused of being too lax instead of being too severe.

But she could well have afforded to be more tolerant, for she could more than hold her own in argument. As early as 1562 her great champion against Rome had put forth his immortal work (Jewell's 'Apology'), which defined and defended her position in a way which rendered that position really impregnable, though its publication was at once the signal for attacks upon it. It is a real refreshment to turn for a moment from cruel laws and cruel plots to the peaceful field of Bishop Jewell's 'Apologia Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ.' This great work arose out of a sermon preached by Jewell on June 18, 1559, in which he defended the Church of England

against Rome on primitive and Catholic grounds, and declared plainly that he was content to give up her cause if her opponents could show that they had the authority of the Fathers, or of the tradition of the Primitive Church, in favour of any of those doctrines on which the reformed Church of England differed from the Church of Rome.[1] Archbishop Parker was delighted at the line he took, sought him out, and persuaded him to write his immortal book. It was the first of a long series of masterpieces, which rendered the Church of England unassailable from the Roman side, so far as argument is concerned. Unfortunately, men are not led by argument so much as by feeling and taste and adroit treatment; and in these respects Rome offered attractions to many which, at least for three centuries after the Reformation, England did not. Field, Bramhall, Laud, Barrow, and a host of great theologians, whose defences of England against Rome are still a rich intellectual treat, and may well make one exclaim, 'Clerus Anglicanus stupor mundi,' all followed in the wake of Jewell. The 'Apology,' which was written in Latin in order that it might be read on the Continent, but was immediately translated into English, was answered with considerable ability, among others, by Thomas Harding, one of the Roman exiles, who had once been a Prebendary of the Church in which Jewell was Bishop (Salisbury). This answer drew forth from Jewell in 1567 a 'Defence of the Apology,' which is quite equal to its predecessor in value. It was in the quiet close of Salisbury, not in the uproar of London; it was by the pen of Jewell, not by the gibbet of Tyburn,

[1] See Hook, 'Matthew Parker,' ch. ix., pp. 277, 278.

that the cause of England against Rome was most effectively maintained. Jewell's 'Apology' received a kind of official sanction. It was set forth by the authority of the Queen, with the sanction of the bishops. Parker intended that it should be bound up in one volume with the Articles and the Catechism —all to be regarded as authoritative documents of the English Church. It was through Parker that Jewell was appointed to the bishopric of Salisbury in January, 1560, and the 'Apologia' appeared in 1562.

We turn now to:

2. *The Puritan Controversy.*

In no respect was the practical wisdom of the great Queen, her instinctive perception of what would be popular and what would not, her discrimination between what was within her power and what was not, more conspicuously shown than in the difference in her methods of dealing with the Puritans and with the Roman Catholics. Personally she disliked the former more than the latter; but she knew that any measures taken against the latter would be popular, against the former not. She was quite ready to pose as the 'Protestant Queen,' the 'Head of the Protestant Interest in Europe,' and so forth, though she was a very doubtful Protestant, if anything more was meant by Protestantism than a determination not to submit to the domination of Rome. Moreover, the machinations of the Romanists were against herself personally, against her throne, and even against her life; they presumed to set up a foreign authority against her own: they might therefore be dealt with by the civil power, which was

quite ready to deal with them, and which strengthened the position of the Queen, and added immensely to her popularity by doing so. But it was a very different question how to deal with those who desired to bring England nearer to Zurich or Geneva than to Rome. Pure Protestantism was popular with a majority both of the clergy and of the laity. It would have completely broken the continuity of the Church of England, and reduced it to a Protestant sect, which the Queen never intended it to be; but the odium of opposing it might be cast upon the official defenders of the Church. The Puritans were not traitors, but heretics; therefore they must be dealt with by the ecclesiastical, not by the civil power; they must be handed over to the bishops and the ecclesiastical courts; these, not the Queen and her Ministers, must bear the unpopularity of bringing them into conformity. There were the laws ready at hand; it was for the proper officers to see them carried into execution.

On the Puritan as well as on the Roman side the Church of England was not suffered to manage her own affairs within her own four seas. Confusion was introduced through foreign interference. The Marian exiles had, as we have seen, been greatly influenced by the religion which prevailed in the places of their exile, especially Zurich, Geneva, Frankfort, and Strasburg. On their return home they still consulted their foreign friends, who were quite ready to advise them; and the advice was not at all conducive to their English Churchmanship. We find Edmund Grindal, in 1559, when he was made Bishop of London, writing to Peter Martyr to consult him on the lawfulness of wearing the prescribed

vestments, Jewell writing to Bullinger, and complaining about the retention of Popish ceremonies (though Jewell afterwards changed his opinions on the subject), Sandys, Nowell, Pilkington, and others, corresponding with foreigners.

In the first instance the dispute turned upon the trivial question of dress. The disaffected (called a little later Puritans and Precisians) objected to wear the surplice and the square college-cap. One can understand—with difficulty—the objection to the use of the surplice as 'a rag of Popery,' but it is hard to see why the square cap, which was an academical, rather than an ecclesiastical, badge, should have been so obnoxious.[1] Even at the outset, however, the offences were not confined to these two. Organs and 'curious singing'—whatever that may have been—in churches, innumerable expressions in the reformed liturgy, and numbers of other matters, were cavilled at. It seems a pity, therefore, that the controversy should have assumed the name of the Vestiarian Controversy, for assuredly the vestments were never the only matters of dispute, and the name suggests a triviality in the whole question which did not really exist. The true point at issue was anything but trivial; it was, in a word, whether the Church of England was to be the old Church reformed, or a new one constructed after the Swiss model.

By the year 1564 the so-called Vestiarian Controversy had become the burning question of the day. With the exception of Parker and Cox, the most

[1] Martin Bucer said he did not see why he should wear a square cap, since Nature had made his head round. If *this* was the best argument that could be adduced against the square cap, the case against it was not very strong.

prominent ecclesiastics themselves seem to have been in favour of leaving off the surplice and several 'Popish ceremonies.' In the Convocation of 1562 the audacious proposal to abolish the vestments and ceremonies was only lost by a majority of one (59 to 58); and in Parliament the Puritan element was much stronger still. But the Queen was quite firm; she absolutely refused to relax her injunctions about the clerical vestments and other points. But here occurred a notable illustration of the method she intended to pursue. She was angry at the irregularities which prevailed, and wrote to Parker, January 25, 1564-65, telling him and the other bishops to enforce the laws and require the uniformity which they enjoined. The Archbishop, assisted by five other bishops as part of the high commission, drew up a number of Articles in the early part of 1565, in order to enforce the requisite discipline among the clergy, and sent them to Cecil for the Queen's signature. But the Queen refused to sign, declaring that Parker's metropolitan authority was quite sufficient. The reason of her refusal is said to have been that the Puritans made interest with the Earl of Leicester, who posed as their patron;[1] but though Elizabeth would dally with Leicester as a woman, she took the advice of wiser men as a Queen; and she would scarcely have been persuaded by him had not his counsel been quite in accordance with her general policy, and in this respect Cecil himself, Walsingham, Sir F. Knollys, and other wise

[1] 'She was persuaded not to add her own immediate authority to the book by some great persons at Court, because upon their suggestion she said, "The Archbishop's authority and the commissioners' were alone sufficient."'—STRYPE.

counsellors leaned to the same side as Leicester. It was a question of Church discipline, and the proper persons to enforce that discipline were ecclesiastics. As bishops, and still more as commissioners, they had full power to do so; *she* did not intend to risk her popularity where there was no real occasion. The Archbishop appears to have been rather embarrassed as to what he ought to do; he altered the Articles slightly,[1] and in the spring of 1566 made another attempt to obtain the Queen's signature; but again in vain. So he put forth his Articles under the title of 'Advertisements.' These 'Advertisements' of 1566 never became the law either of the Church or of the State. They were simply of the nature of 'Visitation Articles,' or 'Articles of Inquiry'; but addressed not to one particular diocese, but to a whole province. They altered nothing, but simply enforced what they could, and no more; that is, they enforced the minimum of ceremonial that would be tolerated. As they were all covered by the laws of the land, they could be enforced; so, when they were published, 100 of the London clergy were summoned to Lambeth and required to conform to them. No discussion was allowed; the Chancellor of the diocese addressed the clergy thus: 'My masters and the ministers of London,—The Council's pleasure is that strictly ye keep the unity of apparel, like this man standing here [pointing to a man present in the authorized vestments]—that is, a square cap, a scholar's gown priest-like, a tippet,

[1] The preamble was changed, and the statement in the first draft, that 'Her Majesty hath drawn certain rules and orders,' was omitted. They were addressed 'to the Province of Canterbury,' not, as in the first draft, 'to the Church of England.'

and, in the church, a linen surplice; and that ye inviolably observe the rubric of the Book of Common Prayer.' Then he gave each a piece of paper, and added: 'Ye that will subscribe write "Volo"; those that will not, write "Nolo." Come, be brief; make no words.' The result of these very trenchant instructions was that thirty-seven out of the hundred refused and were suspended, and these formed the first body of Nonconformists. There was a debate among the deprived clergy whether the question of the habits justified a separation; 'but some,' writes Strype, 'who disliked the whole constitution of the Church lately designed, separated, and met for worship in private houses, and even celebrated Holy Communion.' This was the first schism in the Church of England, which thus dates from 1566.

The attempt to enforce the 'Advertisements' was accompanied by a revocation of all licenses for preaching. But it was one of the privileges of the two Universities, of which they were very tenacious, that they each had power to license annually twelve preachers without episcopal sanction. Oxford was the chosen home of the Anglo-Catholics, but Cambridge was, as Neal calls it, 'a nest of Puritans,' and would, no doubt, take advantage of its privilege, to license Puritan preachers. Both Universities, however, had their share in the revolt against Church discipline. At Oxford, Dr. Sampson, Dean of Christ Church, and Dr. Humphreys, President of Magdalen, whose positions gave them, of course, great influence in the University, warmly encouraged the disaffected clergy both by their preaching and by their examples. But Puritanism spread much more

widely from Cambridge, and the two men who stand out most prominently in connection with it are James Pilkington, Master of S. John's College, and Thomas Cartwright, who also belonged to S. John's, though he afterwards became for a short time Fellow of Trinity. S. John's and Trinity were the largest colleges in the University; and the extent to which Puritanism had spread in both may be judged from the fact that in 1565 all the Fellows and scholars of S. John's, to the number of nearly 300, appeared in the college chapel without their surplices; and their example was followed at Trinity, after Thomas Cartwright had preached three sermons in the college chapel advocating Puritanism.

But it was not till the year 1570 that the real drift of the whole movement appeared. Thomas Cartwright, who had withdrawn from Cambridge for a while, returned as Margaret Professor of Divinity in 1569; and both in his professorial chair and in the pulpit of the Great S. Mary's Church gave to large and excited audiences his views, not only on vestments and ceremonies, but on the hierarchy generally. He is called by Strype 'the head and most learned of that sect of Dissenters then called Puritans,'[1] and it may be added that his high character for piety and moral rectitude gave an additional weight to his utterances. His trumpet certainly gave no uncertain sound; he was against episcopacy altogether; and it is not surprising that John Whitgift, whose name now and henceforward comes prominently to the front, should have first, in the capacity of Vice-Chancellor of the University, deprived him of his professorship, and afterwards, in the capacity of

[1] 'Annals,' ii., ch. i., i.

Master of Trinity, have deprived him of his Fellowship.

It is a curious coincidence that the same year, 1570, should have been the date of a new era in the history of both the parties antagonistic to the settlement of the Church of England on its present lines. As the Bull of Pius V. marked a new phase of hostility on the part of Rome, so did the utterances of Cartwright mark a new phase on the part of Puritanism. Henceforth it could no longer be regarded as a question as to what dresses the bishops and clergy were to wear, but as to whether there were to be any bishops and clergy to wear them ; for if Cartwright's views had prevailed, there would have been no bishops or clergy, in the sense in which the terms had been always and universally understood in England. It was now seen that the Puritans' quarrel was not with individual prelates, but with prelacy as a system. Puritanism gradually assumed the shape either of Presbyterianism or of Congregationalism ; and it was well that the Church should at last learn the true meaning of the points at issue. Nor was it merely liberty of conscience that Cartwright and his friends claimed. The unexceptionable testimony of Dr. Hallam, who is certainly not over-partial to the Church, is express on this point. 'Cartwright's object,' he writes, 'was not to obtain a toleration of Dissent, nor even, by abolishing the whole ecclesiastical polity, to put different religions on an equal footing, but to substitute his own model of government the one exclusive, unappealable standard of obedience, with all the endowment, so far as applicable to its frame, of the present Church, and with all the support to its discipline which the civil power

could afford.'[1] Cartwright's name will appear again, but we must now return to the general history of the Church.

The diocese of London was one of the chief centres of Puritanism. Edmund Grindal, its Bishop, one of the returned Marian exiles, had himself, as we have seen, been doubtful about the lawfulness of the vestments; so it was hardly to be expected that he would be a firm supporter of the Queen and the Archbishop in their efforts to bring the Puritans into obedience to the Act of Uniformity.

Grindal was a protégé of Archbishop Parker, who had hoped to find in him a valuable coadjutor; and so indeed he was, when his mind was once made up. He was not a man who had not the courage of his opinions; but those opinions themselves were not definitely fixed. Like most men who are not certain of their position, he managed to offend both sides. The High Churchmen complained of his laxity; the Puritans, when he sided against them, of his insincerity. But that he was not deficient in moral courage his noble remonstrance with the Queen against her arbitrariness in Church matters is a sufficient proof.[2] In 1570 a vacancy occurred at York, and Grindal was appointed to the archbishopric through the influence of Parker;[3] but,

[1] 'Const. Hist.,' i. 188.

[2] See his letter to the Queen, December 20, 1576, in Hook's 'Lives of the Archbishops,' Edmund Grindal, vol. v., New Series, ch. xxi., pp. 94-99.

[3] Archbishop Parker said 'that he liked well the removal of Grindal, for he reckoned him not resolute and severe enough for the government of London, since many of the ministers and people thereof, notwithstanding all his pains, still leaned to their former prejudices against all measures of reform' (quoted by

strange to say, he was succeeded in London by Bishop Sandys, who was even more Puritanically inclined than himself.

The year 1571 saw the commencement of a new movement, which created far more excitement than could have been expected from its apparently simple and innocuous character. This was the establishment of what were called *Prophesyings* or *Exercises*, which were nothing more than clerical meetings for the purpose of discussing passages of Holy Scriptures. Of course, in themselves such meetings were not only harmless, but almost essential, if the clergy really desired to come to a proper understanding among themselves on vital points, for the decision of which 'the law and the testimony' must, after all, be the ultimate court of appeal. But one can well understand how powerful an engine they might become for advancing the cause of the party which was most strongly represented in them. That party was the party of the Puritans, for the Puritan divines had made a greater point of studying the Holy Scriptures than their adversaries had done; and that it was a Puritan movement is shown by the fact that the two dioceses in which the prophesyings were most popular, London and Norwich, were just the dioceses in which Puritanism was most rife. Archbishop Parker said no more than the truth when he declared that the prophesyings had become mere nurseries of Puritanism. In 1573 they had spread through the dioceses of York, Chester, Durham, and Ely, and no doubt also in other parts of the kingdom. The bishops strove to regulate them,

Dean Hook, 'Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury,' vol. v., New Series, ch. xx., p. 75).

but the Queen was determined to put them down with a high hand; and Archbishop Parker seems to have agreed with her. She began with the diocese of Norwich, where the Bishop, Dr. Parkhurst, was an aged man, and was neither able nor willing to exercise his authority against the Puritans, for he was half inclined to Puritanism himself. He remonstrated with the Archbishop, and, when that was of no avail, wrote to the Privy Council against the attempt to suppress the prophesyings. The Council, not being aware of the Queen's feelings on the subject, authorized the Bishop to uphold them; but when the Queen's will was known, the Council quickly gave way, and Bishop Parkhurst was forced to suppress them.

On May 17, 1575, Archbishop Parker died, and was succeeded by Grindal, Archbishop of York, of all men in the world!—that same Grindal who, five years before, was thought too weak to rule the diocese of London with sufficient severity. His appointment was due to Cecil, who, as a cautious statesman, thought that it was desirable to conciliate a rapidly-increasing party. The Queen gave way, though at this time (1575) she was so set against the Puritans that she would not convene Parliament, on account of the Puritanical temper which the Commons had shown. The question of the prophesyings, however, soon brought the Queen and the new Archbishop into collision. Grindal was for regulating, Elizabeth for suppressing, the obnoxious assemblies; and neither would yield. Grindal issued orders that the meetings should be licensed by the Bishop of the diocese, and be presided over by the Archdeacon or his deputy; that only approved per-

sons should be permitted to speak, and that no political or personal references should be allowed; but he would go no further. As he persisted in refusing to use his metropolitan authority to suppress the prophesyings, the Queen referred the case to the Star Chamber, and Grindal was actually suspended from his functions for six months, and his see sequestrated, a strangely arbitrary proceeding.[1] On May 7, 1577, the Queen issued Letters for the suppression of the prophesyings, which the bishops, though reluctant, were bound to obey; and the prophesyings ceased.

The prophesyings were suppressed, but the party by which they were supposed to be directed was not suppressed with them. On the contrary, Puritanism increased more and more as the years rolled on, reaching its culminating point in the publication of the famous Marprelate Tracts. The opposition to it also grew fiercer. The Queen never forgave Grindal for his refusal to comply with her wishes in the matter of the prophesyings, and actually went so far as to endeavour to displace him, and to put Whitgift in the archbishopric. But Whitgift himself very properly refused to consent to any such arrangement, and it was not until Grindal's death, in 1583, that the primacy of Whitgift began.

[1] Grindal is, by a transposition of syllables, the Algrind of the poet Spenser, who wrote, in reference to the Archbishop's disgrace, one of the sweetest stanzas in the English language:

> 'One day he sate upon a hill,
> As now thou wouldest me;
> But I am taught by Algrind's ill
> To love the low degree.'
>
> *Shepheard's Calender.*

For the next twenty years Archbishop Whitgift was all-powerful in the Church. The Queen 'eased herself by laying the burthen of all her clergy-cares upon his shoulders,' and consulted him alike in temporal and spiritual matters. It is to the infinite credit of both that in the very year in which he became Primate he remonstrated in the most outspoken terms with her on the subject of sacrilege and the robbing of Church property, and that she not only took his remonstrance in good part (though it must have pricked her conscience), but took him more into favour than ever. It is not surprising that the most conflicting estimates have been taken of Whitgift's career and character, for not only was he the staunchest opponent of Puritanism, but there were circumstances which would naturally exasperate the Puritans against him in an exceptional degree. In the first place, there was a time when they might have hoped that he would prove their friend. When he was an undergraduate at Pembroke Hall, Cambridge, his tutor was John Bradford, the most spotless and lovable of all the Marian martyrs, who held opinions which would in later days have been called Puritan. Whitgift would, then, in his early days have seen Puritanism in its most attractive form, and this may account for the fact that in 1565 he sided with the party in the University (he was then Lady Margaret Professor and Master of Pembroke) who petitioned against enforced uniformity in ecclesiastical dress. But the Puritans soon found that they were mistaken if they supposed that he would take their side, and their disappointment embittered them all the more against him. He was for many years the chief leader of the Anglican party in

Cambridge, which had been very weak, but under his leadership became comparatively strong. He had, as we have seen, measured swords in a not unequal combat with the strongest champion of Puritanism at Cambridge, Thomas Cartwright; and his position as Master of Trinity and Vice-Chancellor threw upon him the odium of having to deprive Cartwright both of his Fellowship and of his professorship; when, after six years' incumbency of the see of Worcester he became Archbishop of Canterbury, he succeeded a Primate whose laxity in dealing with the Puritans had, as we have seen, incurred the grave displeasure of the Queen; and the contrast between his rigour and Grindal's laxity added, of course, to his unpopularity. Hence Puritan writers, like Daniel Neal, give us an unfavourable view of his character; but Churchmen, from his contemporary and earliest biographer, Sir G. Paule, downwards, have taken a very different estimate of him, and his merits have been immortalized by the prince of biographers, Izaak Walton, in his 'Life of Richard Hooker.' It is a curious fact that, while later writers blame him for his severity to the Puritans, his contemporary, Lord Burghley, who had, as we have seen, something of a leaning towards Puritanism himself, distinctly states that 'nothing was more to be feared in the Archbishop's government (especially towards his latter time) than his mildness and clemency.' His kindness to his Marprelate libellers, his intercessions with the Queen for the pardon of Udal and others, his final reconciliation with Cartwright, are matters which give colour to Cecil's assertion. Nevertheless, the Puritans were right in regarding Whitgift as the most formidable of

their foes; and as he was a strict disciplinarian, and somewhat irritable in temper, one can quite understand their bitterness against him. But when they accused him of self-seeking, they mistook their man. It was principle, not selfishness, by which he was actuated; the interest of the Church of England as he understood it, not his own interest, was ever uppermost with him; there was in him a curious mixture of a leaning towards Calvinistic doctrine with a hatred of Calvinistic discipline, but there was no faltering in his attachment to the Church; and, as he inherited a patrimony, being the son of a rich merchant at Grimsby, he was able not only to hold the archbishopric with becoming grandeur and hospitality, but to commend the Church by very great liberality, the fruits of which, at Croydon and elsewhere, are reaped at this day. He left no less than ninety-one works behind him, all bearing more or less upon the defence of the Church which he loved. He survived his royal mistress, to whom he ministered in her dying hours, and was one of the executors under her will, for only a few months; and his last words, 'Pro ecclesiâ Dei! Pro ecclesiâ Dei!' expressed very accurately the guiding principle of his whole life. People may disagree both with the object he had in view, and still more with the means he sometimes took to promote that object; but that he honestly aimed at what he believed to be right, all unprejudiced persons will admit. But to return to the general history of the Church.

With Whitgift as Archbishop of Canterbury, and Aylmer as Bishop of London, the Queen had no reason to complain of the connivance at Puritanism.

Bishop Aylmer was more severe than one would

have expected the instructor of the gentle Lady Jane Grey to be, both against Roman Catholics and against Puritans. There is no prelate against whom Martin Marprelate is more severe than 'dumb John of London.'

In the first year of his primacy Whitgift put forth some very severe Articles for the observance of discipline. One of these Articles prohibited all preaching, reading, or catechizing in private houses; another required the subscription of every clergyman to the Queen's supremacy, the lawfulness of the Book of Common Prayer, and the truth of the whole of the thirty-nine Articles of 1562. To enforce these points he made use of the Ecclesiastical Court of High Commission, which was empowered to tender what was called 'the oath *ex officio*' to any clergyman suspected of Puritanism. This oath put *ex officio mero* (hence the name) bound those to whom it was tendered to answer all questions that should be put to them, thus contravening a fundamental maxim of English law, that no one is obliged to criminate himself. It caused an outcry, not only among those who might be subjected to it, but among cautious statesmen like Burghley. There was nothing unreasonable in requiring those who held office in the Church to be faithful to the principles of the Church. The mistake lay in forcing men to be Churchmen or nothing.

The tightening of the bands of discipline, in 1583, produced great indignation against the bishops, and in 1584 appeared a work entitled 'The Practice of Prelates,' which was virtually the first of that series of publications which culminated in the Marprelate libels. The Marprelate controversy, however, did not actually begin until three years later. In 1587

Dr. John Bridges, then Dean of Salisbury, afterwards Bishop of Oxford, published 'A Defence of the Government in the Church of England for Ecclesiastical Matters.' It was a long work, designed to answer, (1) 'A Discourse of Ecclesiastical Government,' written in Latin, by Walter Travers, and translated into English by Thomas Cartwright (1574), two of the most noted Puritans of the day; and (2) the 'Judgment' of Theodore Beza, an English translation of which had appeared in 1580. Dr. Bridges had for some years been a noted controversialist, chiefly against the Roman Catholics, and his 'Defence' of course called forth several answers, the most famous of which was the first of the Martin Marprelate tracts. To this appeared an answer in the same year (1589), in which probably Whitgift and Aylmer, who were especially attacked, as well as Bridges, took a part, but which was actually drawn up by Thomas Cooper, Bishop of Winchester, and which has his initials, 'T. C.,' attached to the preface. The controversy has, of course, a deep historical interest, but it produced nothing of permanent value.[1] The space that can be devoted in

[1] The titles of some of the principal tracts sufficiently indicate the character of their contents: 'Theses Martinianæ, *i.e.*, certain demonstrative conclusions set down and collected by Martin Mar-Prelate the Great, serving as a manifest and sufficient confutation of all that ever the college of Cater-caps, with their whole band of clergy-priests, have or can bring for the defence of their ambitious and antichristian prelacy.' Published by Martin Junior, 1589, and dedicated to John Kankerbury. 'Protestation of Martin Mar-Prelate; wherein, notwithstanding the surprising of the printer, he maketh it known to the world that he feareth neither proud priest, antichristian pope, tyrannous prelate, nor godless cater-cap,' etc., 1589. 'Dialogue, wherein is plainly laid open the tyrannical dealings of the lords-bishops

a brief sketch like the present had better be occupied by an account of the one great work which the Puritan controversy produced on the Church side, 'The Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity,' by Richard Hooker.

In order to trace out the circumstances which eventually led to the composition of this masterpiece we must go back several years. In 1572 there appeared a work by two London clergymen, John Field and Thomas Wilson, entitled 'An Admonition to Parliament.' The aim of the work was nothing less than to establish Presbyterianism in place of Episcopacy. The writers, according to the bad custom of the times, were imprisoned, but an abler man than either, Thomas Cartwright, took up their cause, and wrote 'A Second Admonition to Parliament.' Whitgift replied to both 'Admonitions,' and Cartwright rejoined.

The work arose from a somewhat unseemly controversy, for which Hooker was not to blame, conducted Sunday after Sunday in the pulpit of the Temple Church, Hooker being Master of the Temple, and Walter Travers Afternoon Lecturer.

---

against God's children,' 1589. 'Ha' ye any work for the Cooper?' 1590 (of course referring to the Bishop of Winchester). 'Epitome of the first book of Dr. John Bridges against the Puritans. . . . Printed over-sea in Europe, within two furlongs of a bouncing priest,' etc., 1590. 'Ha' ye any more work for the Cooper?' and so forth. They were answered in a similar strain in 'Pappe with an hatchet, alias a fig for my godson,' etc.; 'An Almond for a parrot, or An alms for Martin Marprelate,' etc.; 'Pasquil's Apology,' etc.; 'A Counter-cuff given to Martin Junior,' and other tracts. Those who desire full information on the subject should read the Rev. W. Maskell's 'History of the Martin-Marprelate Controversy in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth,' 1849.

Travers had been a candidate for the mastership; he is described as 'a man of competent learning, of winning behaviour, and of a blameless life'; but he was no Churchman; he had not even been episcopally ordained, and had accepted the office of Afternoon Lecturer because subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles was not required as a qualification for the post. Whitgift used all his influence against Travers, and Sandys, Archbishop of York, pressed Hooker's appointment. So Hooker was appointed over the head of Travers, and this naturally did not tend to make the latter more inclined to Church views. He took advantage of his position as lecturer to controvert (though without bitterness) in the afternoon what the Master had preached in the morning, so that 'the pulpit,' writes Fuller, 'spake pure Canterbury in the morning and Geneva in the afternoon,' to the great delight of the lawyers, who attended both services in large numbers, and took voluminous notes. It was thus that Hooker was led to investigate the principles upon which the ecclesiastical laws rested, and in the summer of 1586 he commenced his immortal work. Its primary object, according to Walton, was to convince those Templars who were influenced by the preaching of Travers, 'for though the chief benches gave him much reverence and encouragement, yet he there met with many neglects and oppositions by those of Master Travers' judgment, insomuch that it turned to his extreme grief; and that he might unbeguile and win them, he designed to write a deliberate sober Treatise of the Church's power to make canons for the use of ceremonies, and by law to impose an obedience to them, as upon her children; and this he proposed to do

in eight books of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity.'[1] Hooker views his subject from a philosophical as well as from a theological standpoint, controverting what the Puritans assumed as an axiom, that all ecclesiastical polity must rest simply and solely upon Holy Scripture. The supremacy of law explained by, and founded on, reason is Hooker's thesis.

Hooker's 'Ecclesiastical Polity' marks an era in English theology. It is the first really great theological work written in English prose—and such prose! It is also the first which embraces within its survey a wider horizon than that limited to a discussion of texts and an interchange of personalities. It is interesting to note that the man who was the cause of Hooker's receiving a liberal education was the one man who can at all be compared with him in the way of literary achievement in the sixteenth century. What Jewell did for the Roman controversy, that Hooker did, on a much larger scale, for the Puritan; and each effected for the cause he specially took in hand what Acts of Uniformity, Injunctions, Advertisements, Articles, and all the rest of the paraphernalia intended to force men by law into a sort of bed of Procrustes, utterly failed to do. They showed that the Church of England could more than hold its own in the fair field of argument, and their examples were followed by the great divines of the seventeenth century, the golden period of English theology. The first four books of the 'Ecclesiastical Polity' were

[1] 'The Life of Mr. Richard Hooker,' by Izaak Walton, published 1665. See also Keble's 'Life of Hooker,' prefixed to his edition of Hooker's Works, vol. i., *passim*, especially pp. 51, 52, and 65.

finished in 1592, but not published till 1594; the fifth appeared in 1597; and the last three not until forty-seven years after the writer's death, which occurred in 1600.

Hooker's 'Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity' stands far above all other works of the kind, but it was not the only attempt made at the time to put down Puritanism by argument. Richard Bancroft, chaplain to Archbishop Whitgift, and subsequently Archbishop himself, preached a famous sermon at St. Paul's Cross, in 1588, advocating the Divine right of episcopacy, showing most convincingly that from the time of the Apostles down to the time of Calvin no traces of the Puritan scheme could be found in the Church, dwelling on 'that reform of the ancient services of the Catholic Church in England which is presented to us in the Book of Common Prayer,' and warning his congregation of the danger of virtually establishing Presbyterianism instead of the Church.[1] The sermon was followed up by two tracts. Both the sermon and the tracts made a great sensation. Thomas Bilson also, afterwards Bishop of Winchester, published, in 1591, a treatise entitled 'The Perpetual Government of Christ's Church,' which was directed against Puritanism; and Whitgift was an able writer on the same side.

Towards the close of Queen Elizabeth's reign the Church narrowly escaped what most Churchmen will now regard as a very great danger. A little later, Puritanism and Calvinism became almost synonymous terms; but they were not so at the time of which we are speaking. The Calvinistic

[1] See Hook's 'Archbishops,' Richard Bancroft, vol. v., New Series, ch. xxvii., p. 195.

party included all the Puritans, but it also included many who were decidedly anti-Puritan, among them both the archbishops, Dr. Whitgift and Dr. Hutton. In 1574 Peter Baro, a Frenchman by birth, was appointed Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity at Cambridge, and for some time taught without rebuke doctrines plainly antagonistic to the prevailing Calvinism. In 1580 the Regius Professorship of Divinity was filled by Dr. Whitaker, the ablest controversialist of the day and a pronounced Calvinist; so the two divinity chairs spake different tongues. In 1595 the Margaret Professor found an able ally in William Barret, Fellow of Gonville and Caius, who preached a University sermon which in the then state of opinion at Cambridge was regarded as heterodox. After much dispute, the matter was referred to the Archbishop, who, after various negociations, summoned a conference at Lambeth, at which the famous Lambeth Articles, nine in number, were agreed upon. They embraced all the points of Calvinism, stated in the strongest and most uncompromising terms; but happily, on the remonstrance, it is said, of the Queen herself, supported by Lord Burghley, and the even then distinguished names of Andrewes and Overall, they were withdrawn by the Archbishop, and thus the Church of England did not commit herself to the gloomiest and cruelest of creeds.[1]

[1] The Lambeth Articles were as follows:

'1. God hath from eternity predestinated certain persons to life, and hath reprobated certain persons unto death.

'2. The moving or efficient cause of predestination unto life is not the foresight of faith, or of perseverance, or of good works, or of anything that is in the persons predestinated, but the alone will of God's good pleasure.

To sum up the history of the Elizabethan Church: It had, no doubt, made considerable way, and it was gradually settling itself into its proper position. But it was far too much of a political, too little of a purely religious, institution. With the exception of Jewell and Hooker, it produced no theological writers of the first rank. It is a remarkable fact that, while the Elizabethan era is unrivalled in English literature, Hooker's book is the one single specimen of a theological work[1] that can be placed among the many great masterpieces of the period. The Elizabethan Church was not interesting; it awakened no enthusiasm. If the hagiology of the Church were ever written, the period would be found to contribute few who would naturally find a place in the list of saints.[2] It has been necessary to dwell at

---

'3. The predestinate are a predetermined and certain number which can neither be lessened nor increased.

'4. Such as are not predestinated to salvation shall inevitably be condemned on account of their sins.

'5. The true, lively, and justifying faith, and the Spirit of God justifying, is not extinguished, doth not utterly fail, doth not vanish away in the elect, either finally or totally.

'6. A true believer—that is, one endued with justifying faith—is certified, by the full assurance of faith, that his sins are forgiven, and that he shall be everlastingly saved by Christ.

'7. Saving grace is not allowed, is not imparted, is not granted to all men, by which they may be saved if they will.

'8. No man is able to come to Christ unless it be given him, and unless the Father draw him; and all men are not drawn by the Father that they may come to His Son.

'9. It is not in the will and power of every man to be saved.'

[1] Jewell, of course, wrote in Latin, and therefore does not count in English literature.

[2] This applies, more or less, to the whole century. As Bishop Creighton truly says: 'It is well to abandon all illusions about the sixteenth century. There were strong men, there were

some length upon its history, because it is a highly important one in the development of the Church; but the reader will probably have felt, as the writer has felt painfully, that he has never seemed to stand on the highest level, and that the Church can surely rise to greater heights than she ever reached during the last half of the sixteenth century.

---

powerful minds, but there was a dearth of beautiful characters. A time of revolt and upheaval is a time of one-sided energy, and of moral uncertainty, of hardship, of unsound argument, of imperfect self-control, of vacillation, of self-seeking. It is difficult in such a time to find heroes—to discover a man whom we can unreservedly admire' (Laud Commemoration Lecture).

END OF VOL. I.

BILLING AND SONS, PRINTERS, GUILDFORD.

3, Paternoster Buildings, E.C., and

44, Victoria Street, S.W.

A SELECTION FROM

WELLS GARDNER, DARTON, & CO.'S

Catalogue of Books.

By the Rev. A. C. AINSLIE, M.A., LL.D., Vicar of Langport.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR JUNIOR CLASSES IN SUNDAY SCHOOLS.

Fcap. 8vo. Cloth boards. 1s. each.

A packet of Lesson Leaflets for a class of ten. Price 5s.

Vol. I. THE STORY OF THE GOSPELS IN FIFTY-TWO LESSONS.
Vol. II. FIFTY-TWO LESSONS ON THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

These books are specially designed to help those who have not been trained as Teachers.

By the Most Rev. the ARCHBISHOP OF YORK.

PASTORAL LETTERS AND SYNODAL CHARGES.

Addressed to the Clergy and Laity in the Diocese of Lichfield.

By WILLIAM DALRYMPLE MACLAGAN, Archbishop of York.

Crown 8vo. Cloth boards. 7s. 6d.

By Lady BAKER.

FRIENDLY WORDS FOR OUR GIRLS.

Large crown 8vo. Paper, 1s.; cloth, 1s. 6d. [*24th Thousand.*

By Lady BAKER—*continued.*

HALF HOURS WITH MY GIRLS.

Being Twenty-six Readings for Sundays. First Series.

Small crown 8vo. Cloth. **2s. 6d.** [*4th Edition.*

LETTERS TO MY GIRL FRIENDS.

Small crown 8vo. Cloth. **2s. 6d.**

MORE HALF HOURS WITH MY GIRLS.

Or, Readings for a Village Class. Second Series.

Small crown 8vo. Cloth. **2s. 6d.**

By C. F. MOBERLY BELL, Author of "Egyptian Finance."

FROM PHARAOH TO FELLAH.

With upwards of 130 Illustrations from Drawings by GEORGES MONTBARD. Engraved by CHARLES BARBANT.

Crown 8vo. Fancy cloth boards. **12s. 6d.**

With an Introduction by the late BISHOP OF CARLISLE.

HOLINESS TO THE LORD.

The Character of the Christian Priest.

Adapted from the Freneh of the ABBÉ DUBOIS for the use of the English Clergy.

Crown 8vo. Cloth boards. **7s. 6d.**

By the Right Rev. the BISHOP OF LICHFIELD.

IN COVENANT WITH GOD.

A Book of Instruction on Confirmation.

By the Right Rev. the Hon. AUGUSTUS LEGGE, D.D.

Fcap. 8vo. Cloth boards. **1s. 6d.**

By the Right Rev. the BISHOP OF MISSISSIPPI.

THE WORLD AND THE KINGDOM.

By the Right Rev. HUGH MILLAR THOMPSON, D.D.

Crown 8vo. **3s. 6d.** [*5th Edition.*

By the Right Hon. the BISHOP OF RIPON.

SHORT OUTLINE LESSONS FOR EACH SUNDAY IN THE CHRISTIAN YEAR.

By the Right Rev. W. BOYD CARPENTER, D.D.

16mo, **8d.**; cloth boards, **1s.**

By the Right Rev. the BISHOP OF WAKEFIELD.

DAILY FAMILY PRAYER.

By the Right Rev. W. WALSHAM HOW, D.D.

Fcap. 8vo, cloth boards, **1s. 6d.**; calf or morocco, **7s. 6d.**
[*17th Edition.*

☞ A Sixpenny Edition, in large type, cloth boards, is now ready. This volume will be found most suitable for Parochial distribution, and is the cheapest Book of Family Prayers yet published.

NOTES ON THE CHURCH SERVICE.

Fcap. 8vo. Cloth. **9d.**

PASTORAL WORK.

Fcap. 8vo. Cloth boards. **2s. 6d.** [*4th Edition.*

PASTOR IN PAROCHIÂ.

With the Appendix.

Fcap. 8vo. Cloth boards, red edges, **3s. 6d.**; leather limp, **5s.**; calf limp antique, **10s. 6d.** Also morocco plain, and best flexible morocco, red under gilt edges, **12s. 6d.** [*23rd Edition.*

By the Right Rev. the BISHOP OF WAKEFIELD—*continued.*

PLAIN WORDS. First Series.

Sixty Short Sermons for the Poor, and for Family Reading.

Fcap. 8vo. Cloth, turned in, **2s.**; cloth, bevelled boards, red edges, **2s. 6d.** Large-type Edition, cloth boards, **3s. 6d.** [*56th Edition.*

PLAIN WORDS. Second Series.

Short Sermons for the Sundays and Chief Holy-days of the Christian Year.

Fcap. 8vo. Cloth, turned in, **2s.**; cloth, bevelled boards, red edges, **2s. 6d.** Large-type Edition, cloth boards, **3s. 6d.** [*34th Edition.*

Vols. I. and II. in one vol. Cloth boards. **4s. 6d.**

PLAIN WORDS. Third Series.

Forty Meditations with a View to the Deepening of the Spiritual Life.

Fcap. 8vo. Cloth limp, **2s.**; cloth, bevelled boards, red edges, **2s. 6d.** Large-type Edition, cloth boards, **3s. 6d.** [*23rd Edition.*

PLAIN WORDS. Fourth Series.

Forty Readings for those who Desire to Pray Better.

Fcap. 8vo. Cloth limp, turned in, **2s.**; cloth, bevelled boards, red edges, **2s. 6d.** [*10th Edition.*

Vols. III. and IV. in one. Cloth boards. **4s. 6d.**

PLAIN WORDS TO CHILDREN.

Fcap. 8vo. Cloth limp, turned in, **2s.** Crown 8vo, cloth, bevelled boards, **2s. 6d.** [*5th Edition.*

POEMS.

Complete Edition. Fcap. 8vo. Cloth boards, gilt edges, **3s. 6d.** Without the Hymns, **3s.** Tree calf, or calf half extra, **7s. 6d.** [*4th Edition.*

3, Paternoster Buildings, E.C., and

44, Victoria Street, S.W.

A SELECTION FROM

WELLS GARDNER, DARTON, & CO.'S

Catalogue of Books.

By the **Rev. A. C. AINSLIE, M.A., LL.D.**, Vicar of Langport.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR JUNIOR CLASSES IN SUNDAY SCHOOLS.

Fcap. 8vo. Cloth boards. **1s.** each.

A packet of Lesson Leaflets for a class of ten. Price **5s.**

Vol. I. THE STORY OF THE GOSPELS IN FIFTY-TWO LESSONS.
Vol. II. FIFTY-TWO LESSONS ON THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

These books are specially designed to help those who have not been trained as Teachers.

By the **Most Rev. the ARCHBISHOP OF YORK.**

PASTORAL LETTERS AND SYNODAL CHARGES.

Addressed to the Clergy and Laity in the Diocese of Lichfield.

By WILLIAM DALRYMPLE MACLAGAN, Archbishop of York.

Crown 8vo. Cloth boards. **7s. 6d.**

By **Lady BAKER.**

FRIENDLY WORDS FOR OUR GIRLS.

Large crown 8vo. Paper, **1s.**; cloth, **1s. 6d.** [*24th Thousand.*

By Lady BAKER—*continued.*

HALF HOURS WITH MY GIRLS.

Being Twenty-six Readings for Sundays. First Series.

Small crown 8vo. Cloth. **2s. 6d.** [*4th Edition.*

LETTERS TO MY GIRL FRIENDS.

Small crown 8vo. Cloth. **2s. 6d.**

MORE HALF HOURS WITH MY GIRLS.

Or, Readings for a Village Class. Second Series.

Small crown 8vo. Cloth. **2s. 6d.**

By C. F. MOBERLY BELL, Author of "Egyptian Finance."

FROM PHARAOH TO FELLAH.

With upwards of 130 Illustrations from Drawings by GEORGES MONTBARD. Engraved by CHARLES BARBANT.

Crown 8vo. Fancy cloth boards. **12s. 6d.**

With an Introduction by the late BISHOP OF CARLISLE.

HOLINESS TO THE LORD.

The Character of the Christian Priest.

Adapted from the French of the ABBÉ DUBOIS for the use of the English Clergy.

Crown 8vo. Cloth boards. **7s. 6d.**

By the Right Rev. the BISHOP OF LICHFIELD.

IN COVENANT WITH GOD.

A Book of Instruction on Confirmation.

By the Right Rev. the Hon. AUGUSTUS LEGGE, D.D.

Fcap. 8vo. Cloth boards. **1s. 6d.**

By the Right Rev. the BISHOP OF MISSISSIPPI.

THE WORLD AND THE KINGDOM.

By the Right Rev. HUGH MILLAR THOMPSON, D.D.

Crown 8vo. **3s. 6d.** [*5th Edition.*

By the Right Hon. the BISHOP OF RIPON.

SHORT OUTLINE LESSONS FOR EACH SUNDAY IN THE CHRISTIAN YEAR.

By the Right Rev. W. BOYD CARPENTER, D.D.

16mo, **8d.**; cloth boards, **1s.**

By the Right Rev. the BISHOP OF WAKEFIELD.

DAILY FAMILY PRAYER.

By the Right Rev. W. WALSHAM HOW, D.D.

Fcap. 8vo, cloth boards, **1s. 6d.**; calf or morocco, **7s. 6d.**

[*17th Edition.*

☞ A Sixpenny Edition, in large type, cloth boards, is now ready. This volume will be found most suitable for Parochial distribution, and is the cheapest Book of Family Prayers yet published.

NOTES ON THE CHURCH SERVICE.

Fcap. 8vo. Cloth. **9d.**

PASTORAL WORK.

Fcap. 8vo. Cloth boards. **2s. 6d.** [*4th Edition.*

PASTOR IN PAROCHIÂ.

With the Appendix.

Fcap. 8vo. Cloth boards, red edges, **3s. 6d.**; leather limp, **5s.**; calf limp antique, **10s. 6d.** Also morocco plain, and best flexible morocco, red under gilt edges, **12s. 6d.** [*23rd Edition.*

By the Right Rev. the BISHOP OF WAKEFIELD—*continued.*

PLAIN WORDS. First Series.

Sixty Short Sermons for the Poor, and for Family Reading.

Fcap. 8vo. Cloth, turned in, **2s.**; cloth, bevelled boards, red edges, **2s. 6d.** Large-type Edition, cloth boards, **3s. 6d.** [56*th Edition.*

PLAIN WORDS. Second Series.

Short Sermons for the Sundays and Chief Holy-days of the Christian Year.

Fcap. 8vo. Cloth, turned in, **2s.**; cloth, bevelled boards, red edges, **2s. 6d.** Large-type Edition, cloth boards, **3s. 6d.** [34*th Edition.*

Vols. I. and II. in one vol. Cloth boards. **4s. 6d.**

PLAIN WORDS. Third Series.

Forty Meditations with a View to the Deepening of the Spiritual Life.

Fcap. 8vo. Cloth limp, **2s.**; cloth, bevelled boards, red edges, **2s. 6d.** Large-type Edition, cloth boards, **3s. 6d.** [23*rd Edition.*

PLAIN WORDS. Fourth Series.

Forty Readings for those who Desire to Pray Better.

Fcap. 8vo. Cloth limp, turned in, **2s.**; cloth, bevelled boards, red edges, **2s. 6d.** [10*th Edition.*

Vols. III. and IV. in one. Cloth boards. **4s. 6d.**

PLAIN WORDS TO CHILDREN.

Fcap. 8vo. Cloth limp, turned in, **2s.** Crown 8vo, cloth, bevelled boards, **2s. 6d.** [5*th Edition.*

POEMS.

Complete Edition. Fcap. 8vo. Cloth boards, gilt edges, **3s. 6d.** Without the Hymns, **3s.** Tree calf, or calf half extra, **7s. 6d.** [4*th Edition.*

By the Right Rev. the BISHOP OF WAKEFIELD—*continued.*

SEVEN LENTEN SERMONS ON PSALM LI.

Fcap. 8vo. Cloth limp, turned in. **1s.** [*14th Edition.*

TWENTY-FOUR PRACTICAL SERMONS.

Fcap. 8vo. Cloth limp, turned in, **2s.**; cloth boards, red edges, **2s. 6d.** [*14th Edition.*

WORDS OF GOOD CHEER.

Fcap. 8vo. Cloth limp, **1s. 6d.** Small crown 8vo, cloth, bevelled boards, **2s. 6d.**

By the Rev. JOHN C. BLISSARD, M.A.

SIDELIGHTS ON REVELATION.

Crown 8vo. Cloth boards. **2s. 6d.**

By the late Rev. H. W. BURROWS, B.D., Canon of Rochester.

THE EVE OF ORDINATION.

Fcap. 8vo. Cloth limp. **1s. 6d.** [*4th Edition.*

Containing:—Two Meditations before Holy Communion—The Young Clergyman's Dangers and Safeguards—Visiting the Sick—A few Words on Writing Sermons—An Address on the Day of Ordination.

By the Rev. F. C. WOODHOUSE, M.A., Vicar of Holy Trinity, Folkestone.

Uniform with "A Manual for Lent," &c.

A MANUAL OF READINGS FOR SPECIAL OCCASIONS.

Thoughts for the Times.

Crown 8vo. Cloth boards. **3s. 6d.**

The New Work by the Rev. H. BICKERSTETH OTTLEY, M.A., Vicar of Eastbourne.

CHRIST AND THE WORLD.

Aspects of Faith and Duty.

Crown 8vo. Cloth boards. [*In the Press.*

By the Countess COWPER.

HELP AT HAND;

Or, What shall we do in Accidents or Illness?

Numerous Illustrations.

Fcap. 8vo, paper cover, 3d.; cloth, 6d. [4th *Edition.*

By the Rev. EVAN DANIEL, M.A.

THE DAILY OFFICES AND LITANY.

Being an Introduction to the Study of the Prayer-Book. Specially designed for the Use of National Schools and Sunday Schools.

Fcap. 8vo, 8d.; cloth boards, 10d. [12*th Thousand.*

THE PRAYER-BOOK.

Its History, Language, and Contents.

Crown 8vo. Cloth boards. 6s. [16*th Edition.*

DICTIONARY OF THE ENGLISH CHURCH, ANCIENT AND MODERN.

Crown 8vo. Cloth boards. 7s. 6d.

Edited by the Rev. P. H. DITCHFIELD, M.A., F.R.Hist.S.

THE NATIONAL CHURCHES.

I. GERMANY. By the Rev. S. BARING-GOULD, M.A., author of "Mehalah," "Germany Past and Present," &c. With Maps. Crown 8vo. Cloth boards. 6s.

II. SPAIN. By the Rev. FREDERICK MEYRICK, M.A., Prebendary of Lincoln. Editor of "The Foreign Church Chronicle." With Map. Crown 8vo. Cloth boards. 6s.

III. IRELAND. By the Rev. THOMAS OLDEN, M.A. With Maps. Crown 8vo. Cloth boards. 6s.

Arrangements have been made for volumes by the BISHOP OF DELAWARE, CANON LUCKOCK, CANON MACLEAR, and others.

By the Rev. HENRY T. ELLISON, M.A.

HOLY MATRIMONY.

The Married Life of the Christian Man and Woman.

Fcap. 8vo. Cloth boards. **1s. 6d.** [*New Edition.*

By the late Rev. THOMAS FARRAR, Archdeacon of Guiana.

THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY.

Crown 8vo. Cloth boards. **6s.** This volume has been largely used in the Colonies as a Manual for Candidates for Ordination. The present issue has been carefully revised.

[*4th Edition—Revised and Enlarged.*

THE FAMILY LESSON-BOOK.

Being a Selection of Morning and Evening Readings for the Christian Year. Based upon the Church's Lectionary.

Crown 8vo, cloth boards, with silk registers, **1s. 6d.**; leather, **3s. 6d.**

Each Reading is complete in itself, and affords a simple subject for meditation. Every Holy-Day will be found to be conveniently noted, and the Readings to correspond with its proper teaching. The cheapest book of the kind ever published.

By Mrs. E. M. FIELD.

THE CHILD AND HIS BOOK.

Some Account of the History and Progress of Children's Literature in England.

Illustrated.

Large crown 8vo. Cloth boards. **6s.** [*2nd Edition*

By Mrs. E. M. FIELD—*continued.*

ETHNE.

Being a truthful History of the great and final Settlement of Ireland by Oliver Cromwell, and certain other noteworthy Events from the Journals of Ethne O'Connor, and of Roger Standfast, Captain in the Army of the Commons of England.

With Etched Title and Frontispiece. Large crown 8vo. Appropriate cloth boards. **6s.** [*3rd Edition.*

By the Rev. JOSEPH HAMMOND, LL.B., B.A.

CHURCH OR CHAPEL?

An Eirenicon.

Crown 8vo. Cloth boards. **5s.**

[*3rd Edition, with Additions and Appendix.*

By the Hon. Mrs. C. HOBART, *née* N. P. W.

THE CHANGED CROSS.

With Outline Illustrations by H. J. A. MILES.

Square 16mo. Cloth, bevelled boards, gilt edges. **1s. 6d.**

[*33rd Edition.*

By the Rev. EDWIN HOBSON, M.A.

AIDS TO THE STUDY OF THE BOOKS OF SAMUEL.

Fcap. 8vo, cloth boards, 2 vols. **1s. 6d.** each; or 1 vol. complete, with Map, **2s. 6d.**

The New Work by the Right Hon. the EARL and COUNTESS OF MEATH.

SOCIAL AIMS.

Crown 8vo. Cloth boards. **6s.**

LONDON: WELLS GARDNER, DARTON, & CO.
3, PATERNOSTER BUILDINGS, E.C.,
AND 44, VICTORIA STREET, WESTMINSTER, S.W.

By the Right Rev. the BISHOP OF WAKEFIELD—*continued.*

SEVEN LENTEN SERMONS ON PSALM LI.

Fcap. 8vo. Cloth limp, turned in. **1s.** [*14th Edition.*

TWENTY-FOUR PRACTICAL SERMONS.

Fcap. 8vo. Cloth limp, turned in, **2s.**; cloth boards, red edges, **2s. 6d.** [*14th Edition.*

WORDS OF GOOD CHEER.

Fcap. 8vo. Cloth limp, **1s. 6d.** Small crown 8vo, cloth, bevelled boards, **2s. 6d.**

By the Rev. JOHN C. BLISSARD, M.A.

SIDELIGHTS ON REVELATION.

Crown 8vo. Cloth boards. **2s. 6d.**

By the late Rev. H. W. BURROWS, B.D., Canon of Rochester.

THE EVE OF ORDINATION.

Fcap. 8vo. Cloth limp. **1s. 6d.** [*4th Edition.*

Containing:—Two Meditations before Holy Communion—The Young Clergyman's Dangers and Safeguards—Visiting the Sick—A few Words on Writing Sermons—An Address on the Day of Ordination.

By the Rev. F. C. WOODHOUSE, M.A., Vicar of Holy Trinity, Folkestone.

Uniform with "A Manual for Lent," &c.

A MANUAL OF READINGS FOR SPECIAL OCCASIONS.

Thoughts for the Times.

Crown 8vo. Cloth boards. **3s. 6d.**

The New Work by the Rev. H. BICKERSTETH OTTLEY, M.A., Vicar of Eastbourne.

CHRIST AND THE WORLD.

Aspects of Faith and Duty.

Crown 8vo. Cloth boards. [*In the Press.*

By the **Countess COWPER.**

HELP AT HAND;

Or, What shall we do in Accidents or Illness?

Numerous Illustrations.

Fcap. 8vo, paper cover, **3d.**; cloth, **6d.** [4th *Edition.*

By the **Rev. EVAN DANIEL, M.A.**

THE DAILY OFFICES AND LITANY.

Being an Introduction to the Study of the Prayer-Book. Specially designed for the Use of National Schools and Sunday Schools.

Fcap. 8vo, **8d.**; cloth boards, **10d.** [12*th Thousand.*

THE PRAYER-BOOK.

Its History, Language, and Contents.

Crown 8vo. Cloth boards. **6s.** [16*th Edition.*

DICTIONARY OF THE ENGLISH CHURCH, ANCIENT AND MODERN.

Crown 8vo. Cloth boards. **7s. 6d.**

Edited by the **Rev. P. H. DITCHFIELD, M.A., F.R.Hist.S.**

THE NATIONAL CHURCHES.

I. GERMANY. By the Rev. S. BARING-GOULD, M.A., author of "Mehalah," "Germany Past and Present," &c. With Maps. Crown 8vo. Cloth boards. **6s.**

II. SPAIN. By the Rev. FREDERICK MEYRICK, M.A., Prebendary of Lincoln. Editor of "The Foreign Church Chronicle." With Map. Crown 8vo. Cloth boards. **6s.**

III. IRELAND. By the Rev. THOMAS OLDEN, M.A. With Maps. Crown 8vo. Cloth boards. **6s.**

Arrangements have been made for volumes by the BISHOP OF DELAWARE, CANON LUCKOCK, CANON MACLEAR, and others.

By the Rev. HENRY T. ELLISON, M.A.

Holy Matrimony.

The Married Life of the Christian Man and Woman.

Fcap. 8vo. Cloth boards. **1s. 6d.** [*New Edition.*

By the late Rev. THOMAS FARRAR, Archdeacon of Guiana.

The Christian Ministry.

Crown 8vo. Cloth boards. **6s.** This volume has been largely used in the Colonies as a Manual for Candidates for Ordination. The present issue has been carefully revised.

[*4th Edition—Revised and Enlarged.*

The Family Lesson-Book.

Being a Selection of Morning and Evening Readings for the Christian Year. Based upon the Church's Lectionary.

Crown 8vo, cloth boards, with silk registers, **1s. 6d.**; leather, **3s. 6d.**

Each Reading is complete in itself, and affords a simple subject for meditation. Every Holy-Day will be found to be conveniently noted, and the Readings to correspond with its proper teaching. The cheapest book of the kind ever published.

By Mrs. E. M. FIELD.

The Child and His Book.

Some Account of the History and Progress of Children's Literature in England.

Illustrated.

Large crown 8vo. Cloth boards. **6s.** [*2nd Edition*

By Mrs. E. M. FIELD—*continued.*

ETHNE.

Being a truthful History of the great and final Settlement of Ireland by Oliver Cromwell, and certain other notworthy Events from the Journals of Ethne O'Connor, and of Roger Standfast, Captain in the Army of the Commons of England.

With Etched Title and Frontispiece. Large crown 8vo. Appropriate cloth boards. **6s.** [*3rd Edition.*

By the Rev. JOSEPH HAMMOND, LL.B., B.A.

CHURCH OR CHAPEL?

An Eirenicon.

Crown 8vo. Cloth boards. **5s.**

[*3rd Edition, with Additions and Appendix.*

By the Hon. Mrs. C. HOBART, *née* N. P. W.

THE CHANGED CROSS.

With Outline Illustrations by H. J. A. MILES.

Square 16mo. Cloth, bevelled boards, gilt edges. **1s. 6d.**

[*33rd Edition.*

By the Rev. EDWIN HOBSON, M.A.

AIDS TO THE STUDY OF THE BOOKS OF SAMUEL.

Fcap. 8vo, cloth boards, 2 vols. **1s. 6d.** each; or 1 vol. complete, with Map, **2s. 6d.**

The New Work by the Right Hon. the EARL and COUNTESS OF MEATH.

SOCIAL AIMS.

Crown 8vo. Cloth boards. **6s.**

LONDON: WELLS GARDNER, DARTON, & CO

3, PATERNOSTER BUILDINGS, E.C.,

AND 44, VICTORIA STREET, WESTMINSTER, S.W.